

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XX, 2.

WHOLE NO. 78.

I.—THE GREEK VERBAL IN -TEO.

PART II.—ON THE USE OF THE PLURAL FOR THE SINGULAR IN VERBALIA IN -TEO.

Forerunners to the construction of the plural for the singular are met with in Sanskrit; cf. Delbrück, *Syntaktische Forschungen*, V, p. 83: "Etwas häufiger kommt es vor, dass mit dem neutr. plur. ein singularisches Verbum verbunden wird"; but he considers only three Rig-Veda cases as sure. Similarly in vol. IV of the *Synt. Forsch.*, p. 26: "Es kommen im Rigveda einige Stellen vor, an denen klarlich das Verbum im s. neben dem Neutrum im pl. steht . . . Da nun das Sanskrit sonst die äussere Congruenz mit einer ausserordentlichen Strenge wahr, so kann diese gelegentliche Abweichung von der Congruenz nur als Alterthümlichkeit aufgefasst werden, welche sich gegenüber dem sonst vorhandenen Bestreben, die Congruenz vollständig durchzuführen, nur noch in wenigen Exemplaren gerettet hat," and Madvig (*Griech. Syntax*, p. 3, Anm. 4) teaches that "ein sächliches Adjectiv, mit dem Verbum *εἶσι* von einem Infinitiv ausgesagt, steht (*besonders bei den alten Schriftstellern*) bisweilen in der Mehrzahl." Brugmann (*Gr. Gram.*², p. 198, §173), after rapidly sketching the leading uses of the plural, closes with the words: "Zu allen diesen Gebrauchsarten des Plur. stellen die anderen idg. Sprachen Analogien . . . und es wird wenigens speziell griech. Neuerung sein"; but Delbrück is less bold (*Vgl. Syntax*, p. 147) about the use of sg. and pl. in our family, and uses the words: "Das freilich muss man zugestehen, dass unser

Material selten ausreicht, um mit einiger Sicherheit sagen zu können, wie der Zustand in der Ursprache gewesen sein mag." Approaching the Greek usage of this construction, we first cite a few grammarians. Aristotle, Rhetor. III 6: *εις ὄγκον δὲ τῆς λέξεως συμβάλλεται . . . τὸ ἐν πολλὰ ποιεῖν, ὅπερ οἱ ποιηταὶ ποιούσιν*, followed by several examples. Longinus, *περὶ ὕψους*, 23: *ἔσθ' ὅπου προσπίπτει τὰ πληθυντικὰ μεγαλορρημονέστερα, καὶ αὐτῷ δοξοκοποῦντα τῷ ὄχλῳ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ* · cf. Dionys. Hal., *De iis quae Thucyd. propria sunt*, §9. Eustathius (p. 759, 38), commenting on the verse (Il. I 401) *οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ψυχῆς ἀντάξιον οὐδ' ὅσα φασίν*, says: *ιστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἀντάξιον ἀντὶ πληθυντικοῦ λεχθὲν (!) Ἀττικῶς ἐσχημάτισται, καθὰ καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ . . . καὶ μὴν ἄλλως ἀττικίζεται καὶ τὸ τὰ ἐνικά πληθύνειν, οἷον, οὕτως ἀμυντέα ἐστὶ τοῖς κοσμουμένοις, καὶ οὐ γυναικῶν ἡσσητέα, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμυντέον καὶ ἡσσητέον, καὶ, συνεκποτέ' ἐστὶ σοὶ καὶ τὴν τρύγα, ἢ γοῦν συνεκποτέον. Ibid. 1657, 44, ὀν ἀμφὶ δὲ τόξα (Od. κ 262): τουτέστι τόξον ὃ πολλαχού πληθύνει Ὀμηρος, ὡς πον καὶ τὰ ἄρματα καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα. χairoυσι δὲ Ἀττικοὶ τῷ τοιοῦτῳ σχήματι, παρ' οἷς καὶ ἀφύαι μὲν πληθυντικῶς τὸ ἰχθύδιον, etc. Ibid., p. 114, 36, commenting on Il. A 338: τὸ δὲ, μάρτυροι ἔστων, ἀρχαϊκῶς ἀττικίζεται, κατὰ ἔθος συντάσσειν οὐ μόνον δυϊκὰ ὀνόματα πληθυντικοῖς ῥήμασιν ἀλλὰ καὶ πληθυντικὰ ἐνικόις καὶ ἀνάπαλιν. Ibid., p. 191, 21, ὀν Il. B 135: τὸ δὲ δοῦρα σέσηπεν, Ἀττικόν. Ἀθηναῖοι γὰρ πληθυντικοῖς οὐδετέροις ἐνικά ἐπάγουσι ῥήματα. Ibid., p. 38, 41, ὀν Il. A 45: ὅτι ἔθος Ὀμήρῳ ἐν πολλοῖς πληθύνειν τὰ ἐνικά, ὡς ὅτε τὸ ἄρμα λέγει ἄρματα καὶ τὸ τοῦ Αἴαντος πρόσωπον πρόσωπα· οὕτω καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τόξον τόξα ἐναυῦθα φησὶ διὰ σεμνότητα, εἰπὼν τόξ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων. Ibid., p. 59, 27, commenting on Il. A 107: καὶ ἔστι τὰ φίλα Ἀττικῶς ἀντὶ ἐνικοῦ τοῦ φίλου, ὡς καὶ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ· οὕτως ἀμυντέα ἐστὶ τοῖς κοσμουμένοις, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμυντέον· καὶ, σχέτλια γὰρ ἐμέ γε τάδε πάσχειν, ἀντὶ τοῦ σχέτλιόν ἐστι· καὶ παρ' Ἡροδότῳ νομιζόμενα ἀντὶ τοῦ νομιζόμενον· καὶ παρὰ τῷ κωμικῷ συνεκποτέα ἐστὶ σοὶ καὶ τὴν τρύγα. Ibid., p. 1302, 15 (ὀν Il. ψ 297): ὄρα . . . ὅτι ἀντὶ τοῦ δῶρον δῶρα εἶπε, πληθύνας τὸ ἐνικόν συνήθως, ἵνα ἐνδείξηται τὸ τοῦ δῶρου τίμιον· τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ἀπλοϊκῶς ποτὲ γίνεται, ἡγοῦν τὸ πληθύναι τὸ ἐνικόν, ὡς μετ' ὀλίγα ἔχει τὸ, δῶμεν ἀέθλιον δεύτερα. τὸ γὰρ συνήθες ἦν εἰπεῖν ἀέθλιον δεύτερον. τοιοῦτον δὲ τι καὶ τὸ, ἵνα μὴ σε παρεκπροφύγησιν ἄεθλα, ἡγοῦν ἄεθλον. ἐν γὰρ πάντως ἄθλον ἐνὶ δίδοται. Similar passages in Eustathius are pp. 557, 29; 47, 27; 1480, 49; 1308, 20; 1679, 58. Schol. Aristoph., Acharn. 394. Now, it is no news that Eustathius makes mistakes sometimes; but one point he emphasizes, in common with other grammarians and scholiasts, etc., living at different periods, from Aristotle down to the Middle Ages, viz. that this use of pl. for sg., besides being archaic, dignified,*

(pseudo-)majestic like the "ausgepolsterte Schauspieler" of the comedy, is also especially *Attic*; and yet Eustathius himself adduces an example from Herodotus! Already in the Homeric time the construction was handled with some caution, and Nägelsbach (*Anmerkungen zur Ilios*), commenting on the well-known verse A 107, reminds us "dass in allen homerischen Stellen, in denen ein Neutrum Plurale wirklich für den Singular steht, *nicht*, wie hier, die Möglichkeit gegeben ist, den Plural des Neutr. auf den Plural eines Substantivs zu beziehen"—a remark, moreover, which is also true of all other examples in the classical period, so far as the adj. verb. in *-téos* are concerned, since Soph., *El.* 340 and Plato, *Rep.* 387 B are only apparent exceptions to that rule. The construction was evidently used with this circumspectness for perspicuity's sake. The whole state of the case in Homer is thus summed up by Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* IV, p. 26): "Es giebt eine Anzahl von pl., in welchen der Gedanke der Vereinigkeit, andere in denen der Gedanke der Mehrerleiheit überwiegt, bei den ersteren steht das Verbum im s., bei den anderen im pl. Zwischen beiden existirt ein Mittelgebiet, bei dem keine der beiden Auffassungen als allein geboten erscheint, bei dem also beide Constructionen möglich sind, ohne dass eine wahrnehmbare Sinnesdifferenz hervortrete. Auf die Wahl der einen oder anderen Construction mag das Metrum nicht ohne Einfluss gewesen sein"; cf. *Monro, Hom. Gram.*², §172. While the above and like statements are rather interesting than satisfactory, and apply to the use of nouns and adjectives, etc., in general, yet they are not without their especial and appropriate interest for our investigation. Similarly two programs should be mentioned here, entitled: 'Ueber den Gebrauch des Plurals für den Singular bei Sophocles und Euripides,' by Prof. Kummerer, of the Klagenfurt-Gymnasium, for the years 1869 and 1870. Curiously enough, the whole of Prof. Kummerer's investigations centre on the pl. of *nouns* only, and hence we can only occasionally draw from him help of material value. The results summed up on p. 6 of the first Heft, summarizing the salient points of the use of pl. for sg. in concrete nouns, would help but little, even were they expressed in more definite words than he there uses. More valuable for us, because more closely connected with our especial theme, is his discussion of the use of pl. for sg. in the case of abstracta. "Im Allgemeinen," says he, p. 1 of the 1870 Heft, "ist zu constatiren die Vorliebe der Tragiker für die Bildung von Abstracten, und

von diesen wiederum das Vorherrschen des Plurals. Es zeigt sich mithin ein Anlehnen und Zurückgehen auf Homer, bei dem das Abstract, als allgemeiner Begriff im Entstehen begriffen, überwiegend im Plural sich findet. Fragt es sich nun, wie der Plural der Abstracta zu erklären sei, so lassen sich die meisten Fälle desselben zusammenstellen mit dem substantivirten Neutrum Plural der Adjectiva und Participia, mit dem er im Gebrauche die grösste Aehnlichkeit zeigt," and he compares the frequent interchange between, e. g., *τύχαι, συμφοραί, πάθη, παθήματα*, etc., with *κακά*. He continues: "Wie das Neutrum Plurale der substantivirten Adjectiva und Participia bezeichnet also der Plural der Abstracta eine Mehrheit. Gleichwie aber beim Neutrum Plural besonders der Adjectiva die Vorstellung vereinzelter Dinge oft ziemlich verwischt ist und man beim Plural eine Mannigfaltigkeit zu einer Masse geeinigt denkt, ebenso finden sich von Abstracten auffallende Fälle des Plurals, in denen wir diesen grösstentheils nur mit dem Singular übersetzen können." And finally, pp. 13-14, l. 1: "Werfen wir nun einen Blick auf die Fälle, in denen der Plural von Abstracten auffallend gebraucht erscheint und seine Erklärung Schwierigkeiten verursacht . . . so finden wir den Plural durchwegs *konkret* gebraucht, so dass diese Fälle auch hierin Aehnlichkeit mit dem substantivirten Neutrum der Adjectiva u. Participia zeigen, das ebenfalls mehr oder minder concrete Bedeutung erhält . . . An einen intensiven Gebrauch des Plurals ist mithin schlechthin nicht zu denken." This last remark applies to the neuter adjective: we shall see that the remark would need some change in its casting, when applied to the verbalia in *-ρέα*.

Now, adjectives can be used in the neut. pl. expressing 'cases of the manifestation' of the quality in question, or even the abstract quality itself. Similarly participles, though less frequently. Continuing the application of this usage, why not apply it to the infinitive also? Hurriedly sketching the development of this most interesting verb-noun, we note that there is in Sanskrit no infinitive proper in the older language. Whitney (Sk. Gr., §§538 and 969) mentions certain nomina abstracta and nomina actionis, especial cases of which were evidently used much as infinitives are in other languages, and the Greek infinitive *seems* to arise from the dative of some of these nouns. "The distinction between infinitives and other abstract substantives, and again between participles and other primitive adjectives, was probably not always so clearly drawn as it is in Greek. The

infinitives of the oldest Skt. hardly formed a distinct group of words" (Monro, *Hom. Gram.*², §230); "they are abstract nouns of various formation, used in several different cases, and would hardly have been classed apart from other case-forms if they had not been recognised as the precursors of the later, more developed infinitive"; and Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.* IV, p. 122) develops the infinitive out of the dative of the abstract noun, "welche sich von den Dativen anderer Substantive nur dadurch unterscheiden, dass sie verbale Construction haben können, u. dass neben ihnen selten andere Casus von demselben Stamme gebildet werden"; and we may postulate entire absence of the infinitive, as of all (other) abstract nouns, in the mother-language. But here is the rub: granted that one abstract noun, of verb-idea, can be used in the plural, why not another? Monro (*Hom. Gram.*, l. 1.) attempts to see a distinction between the infinitive and (other) verbal nouns, thus: *πάρρειν* and *πρᾶξαι* suggest a *particular* doing, momentary or progressive, at or during a time fixed by the context; *πρᾶξις*, on the contrary, denotes a mere *doing*, irrespective of time. But—and Monro half admits it—this cleverly devised distinction easily breaks down in practice, especially in the case of those writers who, like Thucydides, constantly use the verbal noun for the infinitive! Now, so long as the etymological dativeness (?) of the infinitive form continued to be recognized and felt, the speaker naturally resisted the inclination to pluralize *this* abstract noun, as he did others. But when once the origin of the form was forgotten—and that was soon enough, as is shown by the different cases assumed by the infinitive in the earlier language—why not use it in the plural also? If τὸ *πρᾶξαι* = *πρᾶξις*, why not τὰ *πρᾶξαι* = *πρᾶξις*? There seems to be no satisfactory reason why the substantive infinitive can not be used in the plural, just as any other abstract noun, and as a matter of fact the construction does exist in M.H.D., and Delbrück (*Vgl. Synt.*, p. 169) cites an example from the *Parzival*, *zwei bliuwen*. Surely no language of the I.G. group stands above the Greek in flexibility and capability of adjusting the language to the countless requisites and shadings of human thought; and is it not just possible that in the mass of non-articular noun-infinitives in Greek some, like other *singularia tantum*, may have been logical plurals, others—a smaller number—really felt to be plurals by the ancients?

The use of the plural of verbal adjectives in -τος is at least as old as the *Odyssey*, where *φυκτά* is a substantive (θ 299) in the

line δ τ' οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλοντο. This use of the verbals in -τος can be most readily developed out of the *modal* sense of that verbal, since both plurality and modality have this in common, viz. that they do not rivet the action in question down to one positive, avowed and exclusive fact, but leave a certain liberty in both the mood and number of the action-thought. Now, as all -τέος verbalia are modals, we expect to find a richer use of pl. for sg. in -τέος than in -τος verbalia. With verbalia in -τέος, as with other adjectives, the use of the plural is actually more frequent in the earlier period (cf. Madvig, Synt. der griech. Spch., p. 3, §1, b, Anm. 4). Now, as seen above, the ancients (e. g. Gregorius Corinthus, De dial. Attic., §63) regarded this construction as especially Attic (πληθυντικὰ Ἀττικά, Eustathius), and yet even the ancients cited examples from Herodotus, and we are also taught by repeated utterances that the construction is especially poetic: "Imo haec pluralis usurpatio poetis peculiaris est" (Henr. Stephanus, App. de dial. Att., cap. VIII, Thesaurus ling. graec. VIII, pp. 186 ff.). The facts are, more accurately, as follows: The verbal adjective in -τέος occurs generally in the singular; its use in the pl. is comparatively rare. Out of 91 cases of the verbal in -τέος being used personally, about 29 are in the pl. (some cases are of doubtful interpretation). 19 of these 29 are associated with things, giving therefore a preference for the association of the vbl. in pl. with things, not persons. Once it occurs in the gen. absolute in the pl. (Isoc. XV 59).

Following are the passages in full in which the construction under discussion occurs:

Sophocles:

Ant. 677-8: ἀμυντέ' ἐστὶ τοῖς κοσμουμένοις, κοῦτι γυναικὸς οὐδαμῶς ἡσσητέα. Evidently the Schol. (τὰ τῶν νόμων) misunderstood the passus.

O. C. 1426: ἡμῖν δ' οὐχὶ συγχωρητέα.

El. 340: τῶν κρατούντων ἐστὶ πάντ' ἀκουστέα: v. l. ἀκουστέον.

These are the only sure cases in Soph. Gross (III, p. 4) is plainly in error when he refers to this usage, Phil. 116, where τὰ τόξα is the grammatical as well as logical subject, and it is extraneous to the whole drift of the context to introduce this rarer construction. Few things could be more perverse and unnatural than, with Blaydes (cf. note to Soph., Ant. 678), to see some irregularity in the vbl. in ὅποια δραστὲ' ἐστίν. This construction is

foreign to the language of Aischylos and Euripides—unless we would follow Blaydes again, who would add to this list Eur., *Androm.* 63: ἄ σοι φυλακτέα!

Aristophanes (the construction is here almost as frequent as in *Thucydides*):

Acharn. 394: καί μοι βαδιστέ' ἐστὶν ὡς Εὐριπίδην. Schol.: βαδιστέα ἀντὶ τοῦ βαδιστέον, etc.

Acharn. 480: ἄνευ σκάνδικος ἐμπορευτέα.

Nubes 727: οὐ μαλθακιστέ', ἀλλὰ περικαλυπτέα.

Lys. 122: ἀφεκτέ' ἐστὶ.

Lys. 124: ἀφεκτέα τοίνυν ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τοῦ πέους.

Lys. 450: οὐ γυναικῶν οὐδέ ποθ' ἔσθ' ἠττητέα ἡμῖν.

Lys. 411: ἐμοὶ . . . ἐς Σαλαμίνα πλευστέα.

Ran. 1180: οὐ γάρ μούστιν ἀλλ' ἀκουστέα τῶν, etc.

Plout. 1085: συνεκποτέ' ἐστὶ σοὶ καὶ τὴν τρύγα.

Herodotus:

III 61: ὡς Σμέρδιος τοῦ Κύρου ἀκουστέα εἶη.

VII 185: τὸ . . . στράτευμα ἐτι προσλογιστέα.

IX 58: ἐκείνοισι ταῦτα ποιεῦσι οὐκ ἐπιτρεπτέα ἐστὶ.

Gross (III, p. 5) errs in giving *Herodotus* only two such cases, *Abicht* (ad VII 2, 12) in stating "auch die Adjectiva Verbalia auf -τέος stehen so häufig im Plural." But surely *Abicht* (cf. note to *Herod.* VII 8, 4) does not mean that in *ποιητέα μὲν νυν ταῦτά ἐστι οὕτως* the pl. is used for the sg. in the sense in which we use the term here.

Thucydides:

I 86: οὐς οὐ παραδοτέα . . . οὐδὲ . . . διακριτέα . . . ἀλλὰ τιμωρητέα κ. τ. λ.

I 118: ἀλλ' ἐπιχειρητέα ἐδόκει εἶναι.

VI 50: αὐτοῖς πολεμητέα ἦν.

I 72: ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς παριτητέα . . . εἶναι.

I 79: πολεμητέα εἶναι ἐν τάχει.

I 88: ἐψηφίσαντο . . . πολεμητέα εἶναι.

I 93: ὡς ἀνθεκτέα ἐστὶ (sc. τῆς θαλάσσης).

II 3: ἐδόκει οὖν ἐπιχειρητέα εἶναι.

VI 25: τριήρεσι . . . πλευστέα.

VII 60: τοῖς δὲ Ἀθηναίοις . . . βουλευτέα ἐδόκει.

As is known from the statements of countless grammars, this construction is one in which *Thucydides* delights most.

Some of the statements concerning the frequency of this usage are little short of amusing. Gross (III, p. 4) says, philosophically: "Apud Thucydidem paullo inferior est numerus pluralis, quam singularis gerundii." To prove how utterly unreliable such a statement is we need but note the fact that Thucydides uses the verbal in *-τεο* demonstrably impersonally 20 times, pl. for sg. 12 times; besides these cases there come the vexatious class of neuter forms which are dubia, and it is a sheer impossibility in the great majority of such instances to even approximate a certainty as to whether the Greeks felt them to be personalia, agreeing, or impersonalia, governing. This use of the verbal in pl. for sg. does not occur in Xenophon—who, by the way, uses the verbal in *-τεο* in the Anabasis 23 times, not 20 times, as Joost teaches us, 'Was ergiebt sich aus dem Sprachgebrauch Xenophons?', etc., p. 30. The loci are: I 3, 15; II 4, 6; III 1, 18; III 1, 35; III 3, 8; IV 7, 3; V 6, 5; VI 4, 12; VI 5, 12; VI 5, 12 from ω trans. verbs; III 2, 23; IV 4, 14 from ω intrans. verbs; III 1, 7; V 3, 1; VI 5, 30 from $\mu\iota$ intrans. verbs; I 3, 11; IV 6, 10 from $\mu\alpha\iota$ trans. verbs; II 2, 12; II 5, 18; II 6, 8; IV 1, 2; IV 5, 1; VI 6, 14 from ω verbs in middle sense. Passages like Mem. I 1, 6; Anab. V 6, 6; III 1, 35; Oeconom. XIII 3 are to be explained as personalia.

Plato is said by Moisisstzig (II, p. 5) never to have used this plural for the singular; Gross (III, p. 5), however, cites five passages which he thus interprets, while Kopetsch (pp. 28-9), conceding that Gross is right in one, possibly two passages, argues that the others are misinterpreted by Gross. The construction is certainly rare in Plato; yet the following instances seem plain:

Republic 532 D: οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν παρόντι μόνον ἀκουστέα. Kopetsch's argument against our interpretation is far from convincing: "ἀκουστέα refertur ad verba plura: itaque neutrum pluralis suo iuro est positum"; in which event we must correct Plato for continuing "ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐθις πολλάκις ἐπανιτέον" in the very same construction!

Leges 895 A: κάλλιστα εἶπες, συγχωρητέα τε τούτοις. Both Gross and Kopetsch seem to have overlooked this passage.

Leges 770 B: ἀλλ' οὖν πειρατέα γε καὶ προθυμητέα.

Republic 387 B: ταῦτα ὀνόματα πάντα . . . ἀποβλητέα, κωκυτούς τε καὶ στύγας, etc.

Republic 387 C: ἀφαιρετέα ἄρα, in same construction as above, ἀποβλητέα.

Epistolae 341 D: εἰ δέ μοι ἐφαίνετο γραπτέα θ' ἰκανῶς εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους. It is plain that this conditional is not grammatically connected with the γεγραμμένα of the preceding clause: it is vague—sweeping—in its meaning: "if writing must be done."

The *Attic Orators* never admit this construction (cf. e. g. Schulze, p. 5), unless in loci like Antiphon, B δ 2; Andocides, I 136; Dem. XXXVI 30; Aischines, I 138; Dinarch, II 1, we should be as "perverse and unnatural" as Blaydes was (above) in his note on Soph., Ant. 678.

We note a few more minute particulars concerning the grammatical setting of the verbal in -τέα for sg. The agent of the verbal is expressed 8 times, omitted 28 times—which more frequent omission of the agent-specification adds to the vague, more sweeping tone of the command or suggestion clothed in the verbal in -τέα. Moreover, the comparatively few cases of this expression of the agent are confined to the earlier period: of the 8 cases, 1 occurs in Aischylos, 6 in Aristophanes—for clearness' sake, in the sermo plebeius and dialogue?—1 in Thucydides. This expressed agent-case, always the dative, shows a preference for the position before the verbal, which position it occupies 5 times, as against 3 times after it; nor does there appear to be any connection between the pluralness of the verbal and the grammatical number of its agent—of the 8 agent-datives, (ἐ)μοί occurs 3 times, σοι once; ἡμῖν 3 times, αὐτοῖς once! While therefore half of the agent-cases are sg., half pl., the pronoun of the 1st person occurs 6 times, as against one case of the 2d person, one of the 3d person. Of the direct objects of these pl. verbalia, 4 are accusatives, 7 genitives, 3 datives; there are, moreover, 3 prepositional phrases, while in the remaining 19 cases the vbl. is used absolutely. The copula is expressed 18 times, omitted 18 times! This would be all the more surprising, since *in the whole mass of verbalia in classical Greek, from Theognis to Deinarchus inclusive, the copula is hardly expressed so often as once in four cases.* Furthermore, the expressed copula regularly follows its vbl. (so 15 times, while preceding it only 3 times—once in Soph., twice in Aristoph.); is oftenest in the indicative (= 11 times), infinitive 6 times (of which 5 are in Thucyd., 1 in Plato), optative once (in

Herodotus). There is especial strength and significance in the association of these pl. verbalia with the copula always (for so it is) in the sg. Had the copula been in the plural, the vbl. might have been differentiated—broken up into the numerous cases which, combined, constitute the general statement of the verb's action contained in the pl. vbl.; when, however, the plural of the verbal is connected with the sg. of the copula, the resultant is the might of unity plus the sweeping exhaustiveness of the pl. These verbalia generally occur in affirmative sentences (= 27 cases), less commonly in negative (= 9 cases). Now it is not to be denied that a certain sweeping force is given the statement by this use of the plural, however difficult, not to say impracticable, it is to define the limits—as has been attempted—between specific, specific-general and universal command. This sense of a sweeping, more comprehensive and therefore less detailed suggestion or request is present in, e. g., Antig. 677-8; El. 340; Lys. 450; Herod. III 61 (and IX 58?); Thucyd. VI 50; I 79; I 88; Plato, Rep. 387 B; this (characteristic) force of the combination is less prominent in the comedy—where the action is more narrowed down to the limits of the individual theme to be developed—and this *ὄγκος τῆς λέξεως* is sometimes further increased by the presence of the sweeping negative or a word like *πάντα* or the like. We can readily understand Thucydides' love for this stately plural: that Aristophanes' characters are also no little taken with it is not strange, since no class is more delighted with aping stateliness and terrible authoritativeness than the half-lettered.

This pl. for sg. occurs in both transitive and intransitive verbs, but Madvig is unfortunate in citing *ἰτηρία* (Syntax, p. 86, §84, *b*), since this (uncompounded) form is not found in classical Greek.

Proceeding to the dubia, we first note those verbalia which are accompanied by the 'complementary' *infinitive*.¹ We might know at least how the construction of those verbals should have been explained originally, if we knew what case the inf. represents; but even its etymological case is almost as far from being practically settled now as it was before Bopp, Meyer, Curtius et al. showed us that this crystallized noun-form being, as it were, disguised, its prehistoric development is conjectural. Granted

¹As in the remainder of this thesis we shall be discussing larger groups of words, clauses, etc., the fragments of the Orators and Historians and Philosophers will be almost entirely ignored from this point on.

that we incline to the identification of the Greek ending *αι* with the Sanskrit *ḷ* of *védanḷ*, itself a locative, yet the unstable and deceptive functions of these dative-locative infinitives are too well known to readers of the Journal (cf. A. J. P., vol. XIV, p. 373); and I claim that it is very possible that different usages of the infinitive may have sprung from cases which were in origin etymologically quite different.

We can do little more here than catalogue examples. The commonest verbals are *πειρατέον* and *εατέον*. Of these I count something like 3 cases of *πειρατέον* in Xen., 29 in Plato, 5 in Isoc.; of *εατέον*, 1 in Eurip., 1 in Hdt., 10 in Plato, 1 in Isocrates. While therefore the infinitive depending on *εατέον* or *πειρατέον* has as much right to rise to the position of a nominative as any other neuter can, yet as the passive of *εάω* is more regularly used personally, it almost amounts to a certainty that such verbalia are transitive-active, not personal-passive. The remaining cases of the non-articular infinitive dependency will detain us but a short time. *αναγκαστέον* and *προθυμητέον* occur each 7 times with the infinitive, (*ἀπ*)*οκνητέον* and *τολμητέον* similarly 6 times each, *ἐπιχειρητέον* 4 times; *ἔθιστέον* 3 times; *ἐγχειρητέον*, *ἐπιτρεπτέον*, (*παρα*)*σκευαστέον* and *ποιητέον* each twice; the rest (*διακελευστέον*, *διακωλυτέον*, *εὐλαβητέον*, *προτιμητέον*, *ἀνεκτέον*, *ἀρκτέον*, *αἰτητέον*, *μηχανητέον* and *προστακτέον*) each once, according to my statistics. Many of these infinitives are, considered from the standpoint of logic, datives. But, e. g., *προστάσσω* can (in Thuc. and Herod.) be used in the *passive* and inf.! The interpretation of Xen., Mem. II 1, 28 is disputed, but we construe *ἵπηρετεῖν* as inf. of result (or purpose?) after *ἔθιστέον*, while *σῶμα* is obj. We interpret the infinitive after *προθυμητέον* (cf. Pl., Cratylus 421 D, etc.) as loc. acc. limiting the sphere of the leading verb. Is *ἀκούειν* (in Pl., Laws 638 E) a genitive? It seems that the acc. of the active is not often turned into the nom. with the passive of *διακελεύω*, hence the greater probability that the vbl. is neuter in Pl., Laws 631 D. Politicus 262 C *ἐπιχειρητέον* has the inf. The verb is generally followed by the dat., sometimes by the acc.; the dative is as early as Theognis 75. Is not the inf. after *ἔθιστέον* (Pl., Repub. 396 A) a final dative? After the analogy of *εὐλαβοῦ τὸν κύνα*, we construe the inf. *μεταβάλλειν* (Pl., Rep. 424 C) as an accus. We have an especial pocket for cases like Pl., Rep. 378 E: *περὶ παντός ποιητέον . . . ἀκούειν*, where the *ἀκούειν* is, as it were, an accus., *περὶ παντός* being the other in the construction of the double accus. Similarly Lycurgus 15, etc.

Before leaving the subject of the non-articular-infinitive dependency, we hurriedly note the O. O. dependencies, depending on ῥητέον, etc. Some theory of the much-debated construction of the acc. + inf. must be accepted, and we hesitatingly follow, e. g., Schmitt (Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen), and consider the infinitive as representing the original locative, fixing the *sphere within which* the leading assertion obtains. If that theory be accepted, all such verbalia are impersonal. It is useless to cite example after example; the verbalia dicendi, etc., are ἡγητέον, νομιστέον, ὁμολογητέον, ῥητέον, μαρτυρέον, ξυγχωρητέον, φατέον, λεκτέον, θετέον, πιστευτέον, ὑπολογιστέον, διαμαχετέον. Examples teem on all sides.

The articular-infinitive dependencies follow. Peculiarly enough, all the examples, with the exception of Dem. XXIII 101; Xen., Mem. IV 2, 30, and II 1, 2, occur in Plato. Now, some of these infinitives may be nominatives; the majority certainly seem to be accusatives, and but little help can we draw from those statisticians who teach us that the articular infinitive occurs somewhat more frequently in nom. than in acc. in Plato; while in Schanz's Beiträge, Heft VII, p. 75, under the subject of the articular inf. in Plato, Birklein uses this language: "Wir zählten in den echten Dialogen 745, in den unechten 187 solche Infinitive, zu denen das grösste Contingent der Infinitive als Subjekt stellt." Further on (p. 81, l. l.) he states that the articular inf. occurs most frequently, in proportion, in the Gorgias, next comes the Phaedo, then Cratylus and Theaetetus; least frequently in the Kritias, Lysis, and Timaeus. I have counted 13 verbalia on which articular infinitives depend; as said above, all of these, except three, are in Plato. Περὶ πολλοῦ (πλείστον) ποιητέον occurs three times—Xen., Mem. IV 2, 30; Plato, Crito 48 B; Dem. XXIII 101—and everything points to the impersonal interpretation as the true one. The infinitives depending on εἰλαβητέον and μελετητέον—and ἐπιχειρητέον—(Gorg. 527 B; Philebus 59 E, etc.) are inner accusatives, unless final causative; and the personal use of these verbs in the passive is not common enough to imperil the correctness of this interpretation of the infinitives. The inf. after διακινδυνευτέον (Timaeus 72 D) is terminal, whether (logically) a dat. or an accus.; but the reading in the passage is questioned. Two compounds of αἰρέω, ἐξαιρετέον (Theaetet. 157 B) and ἀφαιρετέον (Repub. 361 B) close the list. Looked at from the standpoint of the theoretical logician, scarcely one of these infinitives could be considered

certainly a nominative; moreover, the probability is that to the average speaker they were all, more or less, considered as accusatives, and hence the reigning verbal was used impersonally.

**oti* dependencies come next. The progressive development of the pronoun *oti* into its function as a conjunction is hidden from us, hence are hidden what hints its earlier usage might have afforded us as to *its* case, and the case of the whole *oti* clause. Both in form and meaning its Skt. predecessor *-yad-* had also been crystallized, though *its* antecedent still showed different cases: *tad*, *tátas*, *tátra*, *téna*, *tásmād*, *tyá*, *tyád*, *etád*. If the antecedent is in, e. g., a dative, we naturally expect the *oti* (or *yad*) clause to be a dative; but that the *caseness* of the appositive clause was lost sight of is established, or betrayed, by the fact that the particle introducing that clause did not vary in form, in order to conform to the varying case-form of its antecedent. But the etymological kinship seems to be dismissed by Schömann (Lehre von den Redetheilen, S. 178 and 180), who finds in *oti*, whether causal or circumspensive, an accusative of the inner object; while Curtius (Greek Grammar Explained, p. 218) and Capelle (Beiträge zur Hom.-Syntax, 191 ff.) go yet further, and refer *ote* also to this accusative origin. If comparative philology does not prove the case of the word *oti*, common usage has for all that pretty generally stamped *oti* clauses as accusatives, though not infrequently doing violence to the logical relationship between dependent and leading clause. In my lists I have eleven verbalia thus connected with *oti* clauses, all of which occur in Plato! Verbs of saying and remembering are somewhat conspicuous: *λεκτέον* (Sophistes 259 A, 248 C), *μνημονευτέον* (Rep. 441 D), *ρήτέον* (Timaeus 89 E), *ἐννοητέον* (Leges 636 C), *λεκτέον* (Epinomis 989 B). The genitive after *μνημονεύω* may be replaced by the accusative of the "Inhalt der Vorstellung"; and if *ἐννοέω* is neuter when accompanied by the participle (cf. Krüger, §56, 7, 4), it is probably neuter and hence impersonal when followed by a *oti* clause.

Like *oti*, *ως* is a relative, by origin; moreover, it is an ablative (cf. Thomas, De particulae *ως*, etc., p. 6; Schmitt in Schanz's Beiträge, Heft VIII, pp. 51 ff.; Delbrück and Curtius, a. a. o.). Again, it is only in Plato that we find the few cases of a *ως* clause depending upon the verbal, and such clauses are always indirect quotations—never indirect questions, as Schmitt (l. l., p. 52) warmly contends. Of course, the verbals are generally those of

'saying,' etc.: ῥητέον (Rep. 550 D), κατηγορητέον (Theaetet. 167 A), διανοητέον (Laws 729 E), λεκτέον (Rep. 378 B, 380 B), ἀποκριτέον (Protag. 351 C), λεκτέον (Philebus 57 A). In Euripides, Iph. Aul. 468 we interpret the ὡς in the final sense. To be noticed is the sudden shift from the personal to the impersonal sequence in Philebus 57 A.

Something of an oddity is the passage in Plato, Theaetet. 160 C, in which the irregular participle occurs where we expected an infinitive. Krüger says this is rare, often preceded by ἀγγέλλω: it occurs more frequently in the tragedians than in Homer. The passage seems impersonal. So Politicus 304 D.

*Ὅπως clauses follow. Like ὡς, ὅπως is an ablative in form, and it is related to ὡς as ὅστις to ὅς. What was said above as to the case-nature of ὡς, and hence, by inference, of ὡς clauses, is true of ὅπως: in usage ὅπως clauses naturally depend the more frequently on verbs of effort, striving, etc. I have noted one case of such a ὅπως dependency in Aeschylus, 14 cases in Xenophon, 6 (only) in Plato, 6 in Isocrates, 1 in Aeschines. The more frequently recurring verbals are βουλευτέον (Aesch., Ag. 847; Xen., Cyrop. IV, V 24), σκεπτέον (Xen., Anab. I, III 11; IV, VI 10; Cyrop. V, II 23; Isoc. VI 71; XII 164), ἐπιμελητέον (Xen., Cyrop. VII, V 70; Oecon. VII 36; VII 36; VII 37; Hipparchicus, I 3; I 3; De re equestri, II 3; Plato, Rep. 618 C), φυλακτέον (Xen., Oecon. VII 36; Plato, Timaeus 90 A; Isocrates, V 35). Others are προνοητέον (Xen., Oecon. VII 36), παρασκευαστέον (Pl., Gorgias 480 E; Xen., Hipparch. I 7), εἰατέον (Plat., Rep. 421 C), μηχανητέον (Pl., Gorgias 481 A), προστακτέον (Plat., Rep. 527 C), περὶ παντὸς ποιητέον (Isoc. IV 174), πρακτέον (Isoc. XII 164), πειρατέον (Isoc. XIV 4), φροντιστέον (Aeschin., Ep. XI 13). The logical case-relation becomes confused when (e. g. Xen., Anab. I, III 11) the ind. quest. at the same time expresses the aim of the action of the leading verb; so again when such a ὅπως clause is preceded and announced by a τοῦτο (Xen., Anab. IV, VI 10); again, we expect a genitive expression after ἐπιμελέομαι, and hence also after ἐπιμελητέον. Is not the ὅπως clause necessarily telic-dative, resp. causal, after the neuter verbal (e. g. μηχανητέον), or is it the accusative of the effect? But the verbal in Gorgias 480 E is necessarily an impersonal, its agent being expressed in the accusative (πράττοντα, etc.). Somewhat analogous to the antecedent τοῦτο is the announcing οὕτως of Isocrates, XIV 4; and we are reminded of the note of Breitenbach-Büchschütz on Xen., Cyrop. I 2,

5: "Nach ἐπιμελεσθαι und ähnlichen Verben bedeutet ὅπως und ὡς eigentlich wie."

For want of a better place, I append here the anacoluthon-disturbed passage, Xen., Mem. II 1, 28: τὰς πολεμικὰς τέχνας αὐτὰς τε παρὰ τῶν ἐπισταμένων μαθητέον καὶ ὅπως αὐταῖς δεῖ χρῆσθαι ἀσκητέον; cf. Kühner, ad loc.: "τε steht nach αὐτὰς, indem der Schriftsteller im Sinne hatte zu schreiben: τὰς πολεμικὰς τέχνας αὐτὰς τε καὶ ὅπως αὐταῖς δεῖ χρῆσθαι μαθητέον: . . . dann aber fügt er zu den Worten καὶ ὅπως αὐταῖς δεῖ χρῆσθαι ein neues Prädikat (ἀσκητέον) hinzu. Die Worte ὅπως αὐταῖς δεῖ χρῆσθαι muss man gleichsam wie ein Substantiv auffassen: τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτῶν ἀσκητέον ἐστίν."

Indirect questions introduced by εἰ arise in two ways: "Einerseits von dem Gebrauch der Konjunktion in Sätzen, die sich an Verba des *Versuchens* anschlossen . . . Andererseits von Bedingungssätzen aus, die sich an Verba des *Sagens* anschlossen" (Brugmann, Gr. Gr., p. 233). Then the objectivity of these clauses is evident: the clause gives the limits, the 'in-respect-to-which,' of the leading action, and εἰ itself appears to be a locative (Vaníček, Etm. Wörterb. II, p. 1034; Curtius, G. Gr. Exp., p. 219, etc.). I have not a single case, in which such a clause depends on a verb in the 3d sg. *passive*, to which it could be construed as a nominative. Plato uses the verbal in this construction in 9 cases, and always the word is σκεπτέον (Theaetet. 145 A, 204 B; Charmides 158 D; Philebus 36 E (bis); Repub. 352 D (bis); Theaetet. 163 A; Sophist. 260 B). Only an apparent exception is Rep. 389 A: οὔτε . . . ἂν τις ποιῇ, ἀποδεκτέον, where the εἰ means 'if, when.' Remarkably enough, we have only 4 instances of the construction outside of Plato: Isocrates 6, 102: ἐπιδεικτέον ἐστίν, εἴ τι, etc.; Dem. XX 10: εἰ μὴ . . . ἀπόλλυτε, μόνον σκεπτέον; XXII 45: σκεπτέον, εἰ . . . τιμᾶσθε, etc.; Isaeus, IV 14: σκεπτέον δὴ ὑμῖν . . . εἰ ἐποίησατο, etc. As illustrating the transition from εἰ = 'whether' clauses to ind. quest. we cite Eurip., Helena 268: ὅστις (= εἰ τις) . . . κακοῦται, βαρὺ μὲν, οἰστέον δ' ὅμως.

Here would follow also other instances of the indirect question. Now, the case-relationship of these dependent-apposition clauses is very difficult of deciding. In his 'Grammatische Kleinigkeiten' (Güstrow, 1871, p. 13 ff.) Raspe discusses several cases of 'Satz-apposition.' In the majority of those cases he finds the appositive to be in the accusative case, even though its leading sentence be independent ('unabhängig'); cf. also Dräger, Tacitus³, Einleitung u. Uebersicht, §47. Why the accusative in Ἐλένη

κάνωμεν, Μενέλεω λύπην πικράν? Surely not because in all such cases the accus. apposition is thereby closely connected with some preceding accusative; the nom., on the other hand, with a subject, etc. Many cases can be adduced in which such a distinction—superficial enough, at best—can not be proved to obtain. When in such an instance the accusative occurs, it is used as the case expressive of emotional contemplation; the nominative in such cases is the subject of an (unexpressed) verb, and hence the latter clause contains much more assertion than was the case with the accusative. Moreover, in the instance cited, the emotional nature of the leading verb—κάνωμεν—is in sympathy with the suggested explanation of the accusative, λύπην.

But to return to the matter of the indirect question. Goodwin (M. and T.², §668) asserts that "As an indirect question is generally the object *or* subject of its leading verb, it may stand in apposition with a pronoun like τοῦτο which represents such an object or subject . . . τοῦτο δῆλόν ἐστιν, ὅτι σοφός ἐστιν," etc. And yet in his list of passages there is barely a single instance which must necessarily be construed as a nominative. Nor is the accusative explanation of the dependent or appositive clause excluded, finally, even in the cases in which there is a preceding τοῦτο; for the neuter can, in a sense, never rise to the full dignity of being a true subject; and, granted even that it grammatically does so do, there is yet always possible that shifting of the view-point by which the grammatical appositive sinks into an object of emotional contemplation. The bulk of the facts in hand all point to the objective as the most probably real case-nature of the dependent clause; hence the verbal would be impersonal. It is not necessary to detail the examples in question. Out of the 51 instances which I have noted, σκεπτόν occurs most frequently—20 cases in all (Xen., Sympos. VIII 39, bis; Plat., Gorg. 508 B; Theaetet. 181 B; Parmenides 160 B, bis; 157 B, bis; Repub. 394 C, 421 B, 558 C; Menon 86 E; Leges 649 C, 652 A; Euthyphron 9 E, bis; 15 C; Sisyphos 389 B; Isocrates, II 9; V 35); λεκτόν occurs about half as often as σκεπτόν (Plat., Theaetet. 164 C; Parmenides 160 D; Timaeus 30 C; Leges 934 C, 767 C; Phaedrus 253 D, 266 D, 262 E; Politicus 269 C). The remaining loci are Soph., El. 16 (βουλευτόν); Eurip., Herc. Fur. 1221 (ἀνοιστόν); Xen., De re equestr. II 1 (γραπτόν); Mem. II, VI 1 (ζηητόν); Agesilaus, VIII 3 (παραλειπτόν); Sympos. VIII 39 (ἀβρητόν . . . ἐρευνητόν); Plato, Gorgias 202 E (ιστόν); Repub. 413 C (ζηητόν), 379 A

(ἀποδοτέον); Menon 96^d D (ζηητέον); Timaeus 90 E (ἐπιμνηστέον), 65 C (ἐμφανιστέον); Leges 719 E (ρήτέον), 874 D (διοριστέον), 885 B (ρήτέον); Epinomis 980 A (ρήτέον); Cratylus 415 A (ζηητέα); Sympos. 217 C (ιστέον); Sophistes 244 B (πευστέον); Crito 48 A (φροντιστέον); Isocrates 12, 59 (δηλωτέον). Here again we note the rarity of these sentence-dependencies outside of Plato. Wishing-clauses, with μή, were originally exclamatory accusatives, parallel to the noun-accusative, expressing the object of emotional contemplation. Such clauses, then, appear as depending on verbs of fear, caution, etc. (cf. Delbrück, Synt. Forsch. I, p. 23). The following cases are therefore impersonalia: Plato, Repub. 416 B: φυλακτέον . . . μή . . . ποιήσωσι . . .; φυλακτέον; Demosth. 16, 5: σκεπτέον . . . μή . . . ἐάσωμεν.

We approach the close of these somewhat tiresome lists, when considering very briefly cases like τοῦργον ἔστ' ἐργαστέον, τοῦτο κρυπτέον, τί δραστέον; οἰστέον κακόν, etc., when all common-sense feelings as to the exact case of the troublesome neut. τοῦτο, etc., might be expected to yield to the imperious dictates of logic and what should be, rather than what is. "Der Nominativ," says Delbrück, Synt. Forsch. IV, p. 78, "bezeichnet im Indogermanischen nicht das Subjekt der Handlung im logischen Sinne, sondern denjenigen, der für den Betrachtenden als Träger und Mittelpunkt des durch das Verbum ausgedrückten Vorganges erscheint." Logically, such a τοῦτο, etc., is objective, though grammatically an apparent nominative; and, as a matter of fact, the circumstance that the majority of the verbals in -τεο are demonstrably impersonalia, leads us to suspect that to be the proper interpretation of such cases as these. And they are numerous enough, extending all the way from the very first recorded verbal—Theog. 689—down to the bitter end of the period now under consideration. I have counted 292 examples, which will be herewith dismissed. That such expressions were not ambiguous enough to be considered inelegant is proved by the fairly abundant use of them in Demosthenes and other orators.

Herodotus uses not infrequently what appears to be the article instead of the relative pronoun; e. g. I 191: ἔμαθε τὸ ποιητέον οἱ ἦν = "quid faciendum esset"; VIII 40: βουλευσονται τὸ ποιητέον . . . ἔσται; IX 60: δίδεκται . . . τὸ ποιητέον. But in the following cases we have the genuine article associated with the verbal: Thucyd. IV 99: γινώσκειν τὸ ποιητέον; Xen., Cyrop. VIII 5, 5: διατέτακται . . . τὰ ποιητέα; Oeconom. XII 14: παρῆ τὸ πρακτέον,

the first instance of this construction occurring in the nominative case; Rep. Lac. XIII 5: παραγγέλλει τὰ ποιητέα: Dem. VI 28: περὶ . . . τῶν ὑμῖν πρακτέων: Eurip., fg. 377: εἶδέναι τὸ δραστέον. The situation and its genesis is thus stated in Struve's Opuscula (II, p. 215): "Bestimmt aber behaupte ich, dass diese Verbalia nie epithetisch Adjective gewesen sind, dass man also nicht sagen kann οἱ ἐπαινετοὶ ἄνδρες, τῶν ἐπαινετέων ἀνδρῶν u. s. w. Auch nicht substantivisch, οἱ ἐπαινετοὶ u. s. w. Nur eine Ausnahme statuire ich hier, deren Ursprung den Philosophen, wie ich glaube den Stoikern, zugeschrieben werden muss. Diese haben namentlich für ganz bestimmte philosophische Begriffe diese Verbalia als Epitheta, ursprünglich im Neutrum, gebraucht, wie τὰ ποιητέα, τὰ πρακτέα, τὰ φευκτέα, und vielleicht einige andere; und die sind dann auch in die Schriftsprache als reine Adjectiva epitheta übergegangen." But Struve does not substantiate his statements by citing the passages; nor, indeed, can some of them be upheld by examples from the classic literature of our period. Moreover, the 'philosophic' origin of the τὸ ποιητέον construction is rendered more than very doubtful by the fact that not one instance of that construction (acc. to my statistics) occurs in Plato, and in the Fragmenta philosophorum graecorum I have no certain example to adduce. The normal position and use of the verbal is predicative, and predicative only.

CHARLES EDWARD BISHOP.

II.—FURTHER REMARKS ON THE DIRAE AND LYDIA.

The following are supplementary to my notes on the *Dirae* and *Lydia* in this Journal, vol. VIII, pp. 408-14; X 208, 209; XI 1-15. Most of them are the result of my preparation of a new recension of the poems, to be published in the 4th volume of Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, and date from 1896. Since then I have come upon the edition of Pietro Canal, published in the former part of the century before Näke's Bonn edition of 1847 appeared posthumously. The work of the Italian philologist is marked by undoubted ability and, now that it has been brought into notice by Prof. Sciava's Pesaro edition of 1898, must take a prominent position among the most original criticisms on the poems. It is well known that F. Jacobs was the first to divide what the MSS give as a single continuous poem headed *Dirae*, into two, the second of which begins at v. 104, *Inuideo vobis agri, formosaque prata*. This second half Jacobs considered to be a separate idyl of rustic life and to bear the name *Lydia*. Canal, without knowing Jacobs' theory, arrived at the same conclusion; the theory is now generally accepted, though a doubt remains whether this *Lydia* is a complete poem or only a fragment.

Canal is less satisfactory in his explanation of Battarus. He considered it to be a personification of Echo, connecting it with the similar name *Battus*. Battus, as Ovid tells us *Met.* II 687 sqq., was the informer whom Mercury turned into a rock, called from the information given *Index*, for revealing the place in which the god had concealed the heifers he had stolen from Apollo. This theory is indeed better than some others; for Battarus has been identified with a river in Corsica (Scaliger), a beech-tree, a mountain, a farm-house; all of which views are mentioned by Näke. Näke himself considered Battarus to be a man, probably a slave of the poet's, who accompanies on a pipe the poet as he sings. To this may be objected that the poet talks of *mea fistula* (75), *mea auena* (7), which is more naturally explained of the poet accompanying his own verses on a pipe of his own; the

more so that this is the ordinary habit of shepherds in Theocritus and Vergil. Näke suggests an escape from this difficulty: the poet and Battarus each had his pipe and played perhaps together, perhaps alternately; yet thinks this explanation improbable. I shall venture to offer a hypothesis less impossible than most of those mentioned, yet perhaps rather audacious. Was Battarus the name of a pet goat? *Etymologically* this would suit the name very well, for it suggests the sound of *bleating*. Hesych. βήκη χίμαιρα. Nor would there be anything impossible in representing a pet goat in sufficient sympathy with his master to attend to the variations of the music and either by gesture or voice express the shifting modes—now grave, now gay—which the poet alternately assumed. It will be found in a comparison of the 7 verses where the vocative *Battare* occurs that there are only three where there is any difficulty in applying this view.

| | |
|----|--|
| 1 | Battare, cycneas repetamus carmine uoces. Diuisas iterum sedes et rura canamus. |
| 14 | Rursus et hoc iterum repetamus, Battare, carmen. |
| 30 | Nec mihi saepe meum resonabit, Battare, carmen. |
| 54 | Tristius hoc, memini, reuocasset, Battare, carmen. |
| 63 | Battare, fluminibus tu nostros trade dolores. |
| 71 | Dulcius hoc, memini, reuocasti, Battare, carmen. |
| 97 | Extremum carmen reuocemus, Battare, auena. |

The goat had been present not only at a previous rehearsal of the curse (therefore *repetamus, iterum canamus. Rursus et hoc iterum repetamus*), but often before, when in happier days his master had played on his pipe (*saepe meum resonabit carmen*) either to tell of his love, its joys and sorrows, or to welcome in the spring or summer or vintage-time. The same goat is now supposed to *recall* the various moods of feeling, fiercer or softer, which it had heard and observed when the curse was first pronounced with the musical accompaniment of the pipe. It is described as remembering each of these moods, as the pipe successively recalls them to its ears: the perfects *reuocasti* in 54, 71, which properly belong to the master, are transferred instantly to the listening and sympathizing goat. In v. 54, indeed, *reuocasti* is too doubtfully the right reading to admit of any argument being drawn from it either way, for the best MSS give *reuocasset*, which may be a corruption of *reuocas set, reuocasses*, or something else: in 71 *reuocasti* might, without much forcing, mean 'Here is a softer strain as I now remember it, and which my piping and

singing have recalled to you, my goat.' The last of these execratory moods is reached in 97, and here the goat is addressed for the last time in the poem: 'hear now, my goat, the final strain of your master's curse: recall it with me as you listen to my pipe.' There remains only 63, in which the goat is asked to make up for the insensibility of Neptune (the *sea-god*) by consigning his master's grief to the *rivers*, the goat's favorite haunt. In other words, he is to listen to the sad strains of his master's pipe on the banks of the adjoining rivers, perhaps accompanying the music with a piteous bleat (this bleating, which would be a sign of sympathy, may, I conceive, be intended *always* when the vocative, *Battare*, recurs), possibly (though this is of course fanciful) looking intently into the flood, as if wishing to convey a dolorous message; compare Cul. 56, 57, where Leo illustrates this habit of goats from Pompeian pictures.

The point in all this which makes my goat-theory intelligible is the close sympathy between the animal and its master. It would be, I should imagine, easily understood by many an Italian peasant, though to our less lively countrymen it is perhaps hardly realizable. The goat is not only a docile, but an endearing creature: the poet had probably known his Battarus from its earliest bleating-time, and the animal constantly attending him and observing his humours had grown into a perfect unison of feeling, sorrowing with his sorrow and rejoicing in his joy.

9, 10:

Montibus et siluis dicam tua facta, Lycurge,
Impia. Trinacriae sterilescent gaudia uobis
Nec fecunda senis nostri (nostris) felicia rura
Semina parturiant segetes, non pampinus uuas.

The correction which I suggested in the Cambridge Journal of Philology (vol. VIII, p. 72):

Nec fecunda seni, nostris felicia rura,

'and may the farm fruitful to our labourers, unfertile to the old man,' is not disposed of by Bährens' objection: 'senem fuisse Lycurgum militem parum probabile'; for by *seni* is meant the *veteran* soldier who has dispossessed the poet. As Bährens saw, the natural meaning of the passage would identify this veteran with Lycurgus, whether he was actually a Greek or no; and reasoning in the same way we should be more right in explaining *Trinacriae* literally of Sicily than, as Näge thought, of fertile

crops generally, of which Sicily was typically and proverbially the representative. I incline here to agree with Sciava (p. 20), yet it is a possible hypothesis that the farm itself was called *Trinacria*, and that this is the *felix nomen agelli* to which the poet alludes in v. 83.¹

15:

Effetas Cereris sulcis condatis auenas.

The usual correction *sulci* is not in itself quite sufficient. I suspect the *s* is the remains of *abs-condatis*, the *b* having first fallen out and *sulci* (*a*)*scondatis* having become *sulcis condatis*.

20, 21:

Haec Veneris uario florentia sarta decore,
Purpureo campos quae pingit auena colore.

For *auena* I suggest *lena*. Then *quae* will be Venus and *lena* will refer to the winning charm which the goddess of love throws over the flowering fields.

24:

Dulcia non oculis, non auribus ulla ferantur.

No MS known gives *naribus*, and *auribus* no doubt might find an explanation either in the sough of the breeze or the tinkling sound of the shepherd's pipe. Yet, if the passage is read as a whole:

Hinc aerae dulces, hinc suaui spiritus agri,
Mutent pestiferos aestus et tetra uenena.
Dulcia non oculis, non auribus ulla ferantur,

there is nothing except *auribus* to suggest *sound*. There are sweet breezes, and the fragrant breath of the field; the sweetness comes from flowers, therefore *oculis*, because of their colour; why not *naribus*, because of their sweet smell? There would be a reason if the poet knew the tradition mentioned by Varro, R. R.

¹This would obviate the difficulty raised by Sciava as to the *Dirae* being by Valerius Cato, a native of Cisalpine Gaul. The name *Trinacria* might well be given to a farm *not* in Sicily, perhaps from its *triangular* shape, perhaps from its *fertility* (*felix nomen agelli*). Sciava's own view, however, deserves consideration. The *Dirae* and *Lydia*, he thinks, were written by a young Sicilian who lost his farm in consequence of the distribution of land made to the soldiers of Octavian some time after the defeat of Sextus Pompeius at Naulochus in Sicily, 718/36. The author's name is unknown, but belongs to the earlier Augustan era: it was not Valerius Cato, and can not belong to the period of Sulla (Sciava, pp. 24, 25 of his 'Le Imprecazione e la Lidia, poemetti d'ignoto autore Latino,' Pesaro, 1898).

II 3. 5, that goats inhale through their *ears*, not through their nostrils, and chose *auribus*, thinking of Battarus, the goat associated with him in his song.

40, 41:

Cum tua cyaneo resplendens aethere silua
Non iterum dicens (dices) erebo (crebro) tua lidia dixti (dixit).

In the Cambridge J. of Philology (VIII, p. 72) I suggested

Non iterum dicetur, heri 'tua,' Lydia, dixti

'when your forest, Lydia, wrapt in flames, shall no longer be called yours; for your so calling it is a thing of yesterday, past and over.'

To this line of interpretation I still adhere, especially in retaining *dixti*, a form too marked to be lightly given up. But I now incline to retain *erebo* also, and, writing

Non iterum dices, Erebo 'tua,' Lydia, dixti

to explain the passage as an anacoluthic aposiopesis, in which the future indicative required to complete the construction is replaced by an apostrophe to Lydia: 'when your wood, glowing in the azure sky (as it burns)—'yours' you shall call it no longer, Lydia, for you have transferred its possession to Erebus from yourself.' '*Non mea iam erit, tua est, o Erebe,*' she is supposed to say.

54:

Tristius hoc memini reuocasset Battare carmen

It seems not quite impossible that *reuocas set* was what the poet wrote. This would then have to be added to the trajections of particles which distinguish the style of the *Dirae*, e. g. *quom* 31, *Lyd.* 39, 47; *et Dir.* 44, *enim* 103 *Gaudia semper enim; namque* *Lyd.* 12, *atque* *Lyd.* 56; see my former article in A. J. P. XI, pp. 13, 14. It is true that *set* thus becomes the fifth word in the sentence; but Vergil has made *namque* sixth in *Ecl.* I 14. 'But now thou recallest, Battarus, as I remember, a gloomier song.' It must, however, be set against this that in the corresponding verse 71:

Dulcius hoc memini reuocasti, Battare, carmen

the perfect is attested by all the MSS, and that *reuocasti* in 54 is the actual reading of a MS dated 1400 A. D. and pointed to by the *preuocasti* of Vat. 3269 (cent. XV). Or is *reuocasset* a corruption of *reuocasses* (Wernsdorf), which I have found in a Brit. Mus. codex? This might mean 'Now, Battarus, thou shouldst

have recalled a gloomier strain,' i. e. at this point of the curse, it should assume a darker and more fearful tone, and this, Battarus, it was your duty to call to memory. From a comparison of 54, 71, 75 the meaning of *tristius* is determined to be a song describing violent and monstrous outbreaks of nature: *dulcius* one that dwells on its quieter and more peaceful manifestations; to the former belong the sea-monsters which with the invasion of the sea cover the once happy woodland with grotesque and alarming shapes; or, again, the torrents of rain that, rushing headlong down the mountain-side, spread a flooding waste over the once smiling champaign—to the latter the gradual change from dry land to marsh, from corn to rushes, from the cricket's lair to the frog's spawning-ground. That such a scene should be in any way designated as *sweet* (*dulcius*) can only be the effect of antithesis; but the passage is sufficiently distinct to show that the poet meant by 'sweet' what we should call 'soft,' by 'sorrowful' or 'gloomy' what we should call 'violent.'

69, 70:

Incurrant amnes passim rimantibus undis
Nec nostros exire sinant erroribus agros.

This is the reading of all the early MSS, except that the Bembinus (Vat. 3252) had originally *seruire* for *exire*. However, Bembo's emendation *erronibus*, well agreeing as it does with *seruire*, has gained general acceptance. Näke calls it felicitous; and Scaliger supports the use of *erro* = a runaway soldier, from Tib. II 6. 6 *Ure, puer, quaeso tua qui ferox otia liquit, Atque iterum erronem sub tua signa uoca*. I have found the word, which is not very common in literature, in one of the Dacic wax-tablets, C. I. L. II, p. 937 *Iam (Eam) puellam sanam esse a furtis noxisque solutam, fugitium erronem non esse praestari*. The poet would thus be alluding to the miserable condition to which his farm was brought, in falling under the possession of runaway soldiers, little removed from deserters.

I made an exact copy of the writing in Vat. 3252 and can state the facts about it.

The m. prima wrote *seruire*; this was then changed to ~~ser~~ *ex ire* (*x* a little doubtful); over this altered word was written much later *exire*. The *original* *ex ire* seemed to me to be contemporaneous with the hand in which the MS is written, i. e. in cent. IX. Hence I think it unwise to ascribe too much weight to what may have been a mere mistake, *seruire*. At any rate, the verse is

easily intelligible if we retain *exire* and *erroribus*, 'and let them (the rivers) not allow my fields to escape beyond (the reach of) their wandering waters.' I do not think Tollius was right in explaining *erroribus* as *flexibus suis*.

93:

Tuque resiste pater. †Et prima nouissima nobis†

Possibly the word *rimare* lurks in this corruption. But *nobis*¹ is in any case unintelligible and is omitted in Vat. 3269, as well as in the MS dated 1400, mentioned above. We have had *rimantibus* already in v. 69. *Rimare* (imperative) might well be addressed to the he-goat rummaging the hill-side for food, like Vergil's *Dulcibus in pratis rimantur prata Caystri*.

94:

Intueor campos longum, manet esse sine illis

I agree with Goebbel in considering this to be the right reading. It is found in the two MSS collated by Schopen (Näke, pp. vi, vii), one the Tegernseensis of cent. XI, the other the Weyhenstephanianus of cent. XIII, and is obviously the original of the corruption *esses in illis* of most early MSS. 'Henceforth it is my lot to be without them,' i. e. to be dispossessed of the fields that once were mine. Ovid, *Trist.* V 7. 33 *Cum bene deuoui, nequeo tamen esse sine illis*.

102, 103:

Quamuis ignis eris, quamuis aqua, semper amabo:
Gaudia semper enim tua me meminisse licebit.

Parisinus 8093 for *ignis* gives //nis, and this might point to something which was not *ignis*, but either *ingnis* (a form of *ignis* which occurs not unfrequently in early MSS) or possibly *ninguis* = *nix*. The word is used by Lucretius, VI 736 *ubi in campos albas decedere ningues Tabificis subigit radiis sol omnia lustrans*. It is remarkable that Vat. 3269, as well as the MS dated 1400 A. D., agree to give *Quamuis nix aderit*, an undoubted interpolation, but which may point to an earlier tradition of *snow* in this passage rather than *fire*. At any rate, Näke seems right in finding a difficulty in such a resolution into elemental fire and water as Scaliger traced here, comparing Il. VII 99 ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοιθε; to which I would myself add Cic., *Acad. Post.* I 26

¹ In 86 the poet says *Hinc ego de tumulo mea rura nouissima uisam*. Possibly therefore *ruris* is the word of which *nobis* is a corruption in 93.

Itaque aer quoque et ignis et aqua et terra prima sunt: ex his autem ortae animantium formae earumque rerum quae gignuntur e terra.

Canal indeed (*Prefazione*, pp. 1303, 1304), who explained *Lydia* in the *Dirae* (not in the poem now separated from it and known as *Lydia*) to be the name not of the girl or woman loved by the poet, but of the favorite *wood* associated with their love, drew one of his chief arguments from the very passage before us. The curse expressly contains a solemn prediction that the wood will be consumed by fire and afterwards covered with water and become a marsh. This would give an exact meaning to the two verses: 'though thou (the *Lydia*, i. e. the wood which the poet or his love knew by that name) shalt be fire, shalt be water, I will never cease to love thee; for I shall always be permitted to remember the joys thou gavest.' This theory might suit vv. 89, 90:

Dulcia rura ualete et Lydia dulcior illis
Et casti fontes et felix nomen agelli

but it hardly agrees with 95:

Rura ualete iterum, tuque *optima* Lydia salue,

for who would call a wood, however charming, *optima*? The two verses 89, 95 obviously correspond; the *Lydia* of the one must be the *Lydia* of the other. If then in 95 *Lydia* can not be a wood, and must be a woman, the same is true of 89; and Canal's theory, however ingenious, has no *sufficient* support even from that part of the *Dirae* which he and Jacobs marked off as containing the curse (1-103), still less from the part (104-183) which both critics considered to be a separate poem, *Lydia*, in which there can be no doubt that *Lydia* is the name of a *woman*.

Lyd. 28:

Felix taure, pater magni gregis et decus, a te
Vaccula non unquam secreta cubilia captans
Frustra te patitur siluis mugire dolorem.

Though *a te* is like *ac si* 25, the recurrence of so rare a licence within three lines, and the repetition of the pronoun in 30, make it conceivable that *arae*, as given by the Brit. Mus. MS of A. D. 1400, is right, whether it comes from antiquity (as I should think probable) or as a correction of the Middle Age. The lordly bull might well be called the glory of the altar at which he was one

day to be sacrificed. If it is objected, Why spoil the effect of *Felix* by the introduction of an unhappy thought? it might be replied, The bull is regarded in two aspects—(1) as fortunate in his loves, (2) as the pride of his owner, from his lordly and handsome appearance. Such a fine animal would be marked out eventually for sacrifice: his looks would commend him, as more acceptable to the god in whose honour he was slaughtered.

35:

Et mas quocumque est, illi sua femina iuncta
Interpellatos numquam ploravit amores.

So most MSS. I would write, with Monacensis 21562 of cent. XII, *Et mas quodcumque est*.

63:

Iuppiter ante sui semper mendacia factus.

I have no doubt Canal was right in his version "che fe' sempre di se menzogne." In my note, written, for Postgate's *Corpus*, in 1896, I had arrived at the same view. "potest esse, qui semper se conuertebat in formas quae ipsius speciem mentiebantur siue mentite reddebant, taurus uel aurum uel olor factus."

66 sqq. This passage I would write thus:

Et moechum (*Bährens*) tenera gauisa est laedere (*Canter*) in herba
Purpureos flores quos insuper accumbibat
Clam dea formoso supponens gaudia collo.

By writing *Clam dea* for *Grandia* of MSS, a nominative is obtained for *gauisa est*—namely, Venus, to whose amour with Adonis the immediately following vv.:

Tum credo Mauors fuerat distentus in armis:
Nam certe Vulcanus opus faciebat, et illi
Turpabat strictura mala fuligine barbam.

prove the passage to refer. The conjecture goes back to Heinsius, except that he suggested *Et dea clam for mecum* (66), not, as I propose, *Clam dea* for *Grandia* in 68. I would compare Catalept. III 5, where MSS give *mediumque* for *me deumque*. *gaudia* I retain, and explain of the Love-Goddess' charming and luxuriant breasts. As in Catullus, LXIV 332 *Leuia substernens robusto brachia collo* the sturdy neck is Peleus', so here the beautiful neck is of course Adonis'. The two verses mutually suggest each other: it is more than probable that one of the two poets imitated the other.

79, 80. This is an almost desperate passage. I will quote here my note of 1896 upon it: "*Mihi cordis ex cortis corruptum uidetur: tantam, mea uita (sc. Lydia), milites cortis meae rapinam fecerunt, h. e. tantum abstulerunt auium, ut prae macie uix a te cognoscar.*" The poet's enemies had carried off so much of his poultry and other birds produced on the farm, that the poet was reduced to a state of leanness in which Lydia could hardly recognize him. MSS give

Tanta (tantum) meae uitae [uitae (or uita) meae] cordis fecere rapinam
Ut maneam quod uix oculis cognoscere possis.

I conjecture

Tantam, uita, meae cortis fecere rapinam,
Ut maneam quod uix oculis cognoscere possis.

The use of *uita* 'my dear' without *mea* is proved from Prop. I 2. 1; I 8. 22, and the subject to *fecere* 'they have made' is referable either to the enemies who had separated the poet from his Lydia, or to the soldiers to whom his farm had been made over. As I have said above, the *Lydia* is not certainly entire: it looks like a fragment of a larger original. The opening, as well as the close, are both abrupt: something probably preceded the first and followed the last line. This, indeed, is not necessary; for there is every reason to believe that from the very first an intimate connexion between the *Dirae* and the *Lydia* subsisted; and the reader of the latter of the two poems would supply from the former what was necessary to make the subject to *fecere* intelligible.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

III.—THE LOCUTION *INFITIAS IT*, AND THE *-NT-*SUFFIXES.

§1.—Dissatisfaction with the current explanations of this locution is no new thing. Long ago the Digest wrote in an emendatory spirit *ad infitias it*. My personal dissatisfaction has made me already advance an explanation from **infitiasi it* 'goes to deny,' whence in a prerhotacistic period *infitias*' (Classical Review, 10, 184). According to this *infitias*' is an infin. of purpose juxtaposed with *it*. This theory still seems to me preferable to those now current, but a further study of the examples has led me to one yet more probable in my opinion. Syntactical investigations are always more or less tinged with the subjectivity of the scholar, and I have the best of precedent (Brugmann in I. F. 8, 219, quoting Delbrück, Vergleich. Syntax, 1, 330) when I plead that my own sense for grammar and logic is not satisfied with the explanations in vogue. The very plurality of these is itself a testimony to their insufficiency.

They proceed on two lines. Among the grammarians, Roby and Lane, to say nothing of the compilers of the Digest, explain *infitias* as a terminal accusative. For an abstract like *infitias* this is quite beyond my power of belief.

Another theory makes of *infitias* a cognate, and so Gildersleeve and Lodge in their joint Grammar; but this theory also leaves much to desire, in my opinion. I am not convinced by Brix-Niemeyer's "aufs Leugnen ausgehen" (Menaechmi, 396), nor by the rendering "*viam negandi inire, sich verliegen auf das Leugnen,*" kindly suggested to me from another quarter. We may say in English 'enters upon a path of deceit, resorts to deceit,' but that does not warrant us in saying 'goes deceit, a lie.' Not till I can believe that *infitias* means 'viam negandi' can I accept the cognate explanation. When, further, the supine in *-um* is offered as a parallel, it seems to me all-sufficient to say that *infitias* is not a supine.

§2.—The alleged parallels to *infitias it* are simply not parallel: *exsequias ire* is a nonce-locution in Terence (Phorm. 1026):

exsequias Chremeti quibus est commodum ire em tempus est
sic dabo age nunc Phormionem qui volet lacessito.

These verses, which I print without any punctuation, are capable of two renderings. We may regard *exsequias Chremeti* as the street-crier's accusative like *Cauneas* in Cicero, Div. 2, 84, or we may put the words into construction with *dabo*, and render, combining both possibilities, 'Chremes his funeral!—an any wish to go 'tis high time—thus am I like to bring *it* about, etc.' For the combination of *exsequias* with *dat* we have but to note *poenas, supplicium, exitium dat*. If we may trust the lexicon *exsequias it* does not reappear till Ovid, and may there be a Terentian reminiscence. The formula cited in the older commentaries like Westerhov's: "L. Titio exsequias ire quoi commodum est iam tempus est, ollus ecfertor," has not been traced to a Latin source of any authority.

§3.—The Plautine *suppetias adveni* is also a nonce-locution (Men. 1020). Here the cognate explanation might well stand. As *peto* is practically a verb of motion in Latin, it would not be a far cry to say *suppetias advenit* 'comes on a relief-expedition,' and Plautus may be quoted for *viam it* (Poen. 698, Rud. 1027). The same explanation is applicable to *exsequias it*. Cicero (Clu. 201) has a clear cognate in *exsequias funeris prosecuta*; and Terence approximates it in *funus interim procedit: sequimur* (And. 127), while Ovid (Fasti 6, 663 "et saepe") ventures on *pompam funeris it*. But in any case, neither of these turns is harsher as a cognate than when Sophocles (Ajax 290) writes *τί τήνδε—ἀφορμᾶς πείραν*, where *πείραν* is almost as transparently cognate as if *ὄρμην* had been used.

As to *suppetias* I am not sure but we should correct to *suppetians*; cf. *praecucurrit nuntians* (Hec. 371) alongside of *venio nuntiatum* (Phorm. 906). The word *suppetior*, though rare, is used in the familiar language of Cicero's Letters. If the explanation I am about to offer for *infiltias* be correct, it will not be necessary to restore the *n* to *suppetias*.

§4.—One other parallel offered for *infiltias* is (*in*) *malam crucem*. The full discussion of this locution I reserve for another occasion, but note here that *in* is rarely omitted, and granting for the present the genuineness of the reading without *in*, the locution may be haplologic for *in in malam crucem*? (cf. Terence, Phorm.

930, with *rem* for *crucem*), contaminated with *i* in *m. c.* (at Casina 977 A reads I IN and P in).

There is this marked difference between *suppetiae* and *infittias* in Plautus: *suppetiae* is found in both nom. and acc., where it is impossible to doubt that we have a noun; while *exsequiae* is also an indubitable noun in the language at large. I feel no sort of certainty that *infittias* is a noun at all. As an isolated acc. plur. it stands on a footing all its own. The case-relations of the other nouns, with but a single form, *dicis pondo sponte*, are perfectly clear; and so of the large class of nouns in *-tu, -su*. As for *pessum*, it is either a supine or, considering the difficulty of finding its belongings, it seems to me best to accept the explanation of *pessum* from *peruersum* as of *rusum* from *reversum*; *deorsum, dorsum* (C. I. L. I 199), *deosum*; *prorsus, prosus*; *sursum, susum* (cf. Bréal et Bailly, *Les mots latins*, p. 432).

§5.—The following examples will show why *pessum* prevailed over *peusus*: *pessum dedisti me* 'you have overturned me' (Rud. 507); *istum pessum premam* 'I will throw him down and stamp on him' (Most. 1171); *quando abiit rete pessum* 'when the net is jerked and has started off' (Truc. 36); *eum scilicet abisse pessum in altum* 'he has certainly been overturned and has sunk in the deep' (Rud. 395); *miser non eo pessum* (sc. *iter*) 'though wretched I won't go crooked' (Cist. 223). The Lemaire index gives only one other case of *pessum* juxtaposed with *ire* (Aul. 598) over against six cases of *pessum dare* (one of which I have been unable to turn up), and Terence uses *pessum dare* only. Of the Plautus examples all but one have the object of *pessum dare* in the masc. or neut. sg. One of these, *Persa me pessum dedit* (Persa 740), which is rather like a pun, possibly implies **peusum* (v. also Wharton, *Etyma Latina*, s. v.).

[§6.—I suggest, in passing, that *pessumus* is a superlative to **peusus*, contracted from *peruersus* 'wrong, evil, bad.' Then *peior* might be explained as follows: *maximus: maior :: pessumus to peior*. That *-ss-* was approximately near to *-x-* seems likely from *cosim* for *coxim* (Pomponius apud Nonius; cf. also Lindsay's *Latin Language*, II, §125), and *-ss-* was in Oscan and Umbrian a characteristic of the superlative (in *nessimo-* and *messimo-*), much as *-x-* seems to be in Latin (cf. *proximus* and *medioximus*). It is absolutely unimportant to allege that *-x-* and *-ss-* in the words I am about to cite are etymologically different, if the signification of the words renders them liable to association by popular etymology. In my own belief popular etymology is often of vast importance as a source of phonetic changes, some of which doubtless subsequently became general. With this by way of preface, I note the following pairs: *nisus, nixus*; *paxillus* 'little peg,' *peusuli* 'door-pegs'; *assula* 'little board,' *axis* 'board,' though *asser* 'pole' or, if *assula* was used to denote 'kindling,' *assus* 'burnt' may have to be taken into the count; *laxus* 'open,' *lassus* 'tired,' with orthography influenced by *defessus* 'tired' (: *fatiscit* 'gapes open'). Very significant also is the spelling *Ulixes* with *-x-* for *-ss-*.]

§7.—To me, then, *infitias* as an acc. plur. is inexplicable as to syntax and perplexing as to form, and is sadly in need of a satisfactory explanation. Passing to an inspection of the examples of the locution, I shall discuss them under the terms of the following thesis: in the locution *infitias it* 'goes protesting,' *infitias* is a pres. ptc. to *infitor*.

§8.—Examples in Plautus and Terence.

A. Finite forms:

- 1) quae dudum fassast mihi, quae ne infitias eat? Cist. 654.
- 2) et aurum et vestem omnem suam esse aiebat quam haec haberet.
nemo it infitias. Curc. 489.
- 3) quom argentum dixi me petere et vasa, tu quantum potest praecurristi obviam ut quae fecisti infitias eas. Men. 1057.
- 4) siquidem centiens hic visa sit tamen infitias eat. Mil. 188.
- 5) nam quanti refert ei me recte dicere qui nili faciat quique infitias non eat. Ps. 1086.
- 6) satis es fassa. # infitias non eo. Truc. 792.
- 7) at ego ab hac puerum reposcam ne mox infitias eat. Ib. 850.
- 8) si hoc palam proferimus ille infitias ibit, sat scio. Ad. 339.
- 9) si infitias ibit testis mecum est anulus. Ib. 347.

B. Infinitive forms with subject in the nominative:

- 10) primumdum infitias ire coepit filio negare se debere tibi triobolum. Bacch. 260.
- 11) fides servandast: ne ire infitias postules. Most. 1023.

C. Infinitive forms with subject not in the nominative:

- 12) qui lubet ludibrio habere me atque ire infitias mihi facta quae sunt. Men. 396.

It can hardly be an accident that in the first 11 examples *negans* might be substituted for *infitias* so far as the mere concords go. In the last example there is a question about the concord of *infitia(n)s*, but considering the remoteness of *ire infitias* from *lubet*, the intervention of *habere*, the harshness of *ire* (sc. *tibi*) *infitianti mihi*, we need not balk at *infitia(n)s ire* here. Of course we can not but suppose that *infitias it* was to Plautus an idiom of the common speech which he used, not with reflection, but by the instinct of inherited habit.

That this locution was vulgar we may infer from its not appear-

ing in Cicero or Caesar. After the comedians, the first writer to use it was Nepos:

13) quod nemo infitias ibit. Epam. 10, 4.

After Nepos, Livy is cited for four cases, first in an archaizing harangue, and always, save at 10, 10, 8, in harangues:—

14) quorum alterum neque nego neque infitias eo—illud alterum contendere ausim etc. 6, 40, 4-5.

15) neque ego infitias eo—sed iniussu populi nego etc. 9, 9, 4.

16) qua pacta—cum parata cetera ad bellum essent—infittias eunt mercedem se—pactos etc. 10, 10, 8.

17) neque infittias imus—quin contra hoc et vos et omnes scire volumus etc. 31, 31, 8.

It is worth our attention that in Nepos, and early in Livy, particularly in the archaic language of 6, 40, the locution is still confined to the singular. The plural does not occur until the third passage, and here only is Livy writing for his own hand. Thus Livy's use of the idiom nearly corresponds with Plautus's.

§9.—I find three noteworthy facts in these examples: 1st, they are in the main sharply conative and use only the pres. and fut. tenses; 2d, they are practically all in the sing. number; 3d, four examples have (or at least strongly imply) an object in the accusative.

§10.—In general defense of my theory I observe that the verb *infittior* was known to Plautus (Amph. 779 and Cist. 661), and that its morphological relation to *fateor* is a duplicate of that existing between *sedeo* and *insidior*. I take the compounds to be frequentative to their respective simple verbs. The explanation of *infittia(n)s* as pres. ptc. to a frequentative verb in combination with pres. and fut. tenses of *ire* conforms well to the conative usage of the locution.

§11.—A word needs to be said of the definition of *infittior*. Without being able to demonstrate the fact, we may work on the assumption that *fateor* was a gesticulative verb of saying, like *adnuil* 'nods assent,' and we may define *infittiator* by *abnuil* 'nods dissent.' In the sermo vulgaris of Petronius (§41) *confessus* means 'proclaiming himself.'

§12.—The Latinity of *infitia(n)s it* 'goes protesting' has been called in question by friends and correspondents. Before undertaking to prove its Latinity, I might note that in Greek (v. Goodwin's Moods and Tenses, §895) and in Sanskrit (v. Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, §1075) the combination of verbs of motion, and specifically in both languages of the root EI, with pres. ptc. to express durative acts is well known. So we might claim for *infitias it* 'goes protesting, keeps protesting, undertakes to protest' an Aryan origin.

§13.—The Latinity of this idiom may first be debated as a general proposition: Is predicative attribution of the pres. ptc. a phenomenon of wide range in Italic? Every one will bethink himself of *sciens lubens*, etc., in Latin. In Umbrian there are twenty certain cases of the three certain forms *serse(f)*, *kute(f)*, *reste(f)*, all in predicative attribution, and no absolutely certain cases of any other usage (v. von Planta, Grammatik d. osk.-umbr. Dialekte, §329).

§14.—The grammars give us very little certain information about the usages of the pres. ptc. in Latin. I have therefore collected examples: *A.* from Ennius and Naevius (cited by Ribbeck's lines), and from other dramatic and early poets as preserved in a fragmentary state (cited by the pages of Merry's Selected Fragments); and *B.* from Plautus and Terence. Inasmuch as I aim at a qualitative and not a quantitative analysis, I give only selected examples. These I classify for *A* under the following heads: 1) The pres. ptc. approximates the gerund used in the abl. of means, or more generally of manner; types are *loquens lacerat* 'bores by talking' and *flens obsecrat* 'begs with tears'; 2) The pres. ptc. is co-ordinate with the verb; the type is *adveniens petit* 'comes and asks,' or reversed, *petens advenit*, cf. in the Rig-Veda *ṛñjate yātan* alternating with *yatale ṛñjān* 'coming seeks'; 3) The pres. ptc. is equivalent to *dum* with the pres. indic.; the type is *lustrans saevit* 'wandering raves'; 4) The pres. ptc. expresses—by fair inference at least—purpose.

§15.—1) *manens sedeto*, Liv. And. 8; *vehentem venisse* (O. O.), ib. 8; *volans perrumpit*, ib. 10; *ludens lustratur*, ib. 11; *lita lubens*, ib. 11; *alui immulgens*, ib. 13; (*vitulantes nos mittat*, whence I infer *vitulantes imus*, Naev. 18;) *ludere laetantes* (O. O.), ib. 19; *exibant flentes abeuntes*, ib. 26; *memorat lacrumans*, Enn., Annales 29; *manus tendebam lacrumans*, ib. 43;

curantes cupientes dant operam, ib. 73; cogebant lacrimantes, ib. 174; nec cauponantes—sed belligerantes cernamus, ib. 197; certantes miscent inter se minitantes, ib. 278; insidiantes vigilant ore faventes, ib. 443; tela iacientes sollicitabant, ib. 467; ridens voras, ib. Sat. 30; habet coronam vitulans, ib. Fab. 17; animam efflantes vomunt, ib. 152; lacrimans ad genua accidit, ib. 386; obiectans aptus sum, Pac. 81; praecipitans cadit, ib. 89; coepisti sciens licitari, Caec. 93; insolens fastidit, Turp. 110; placans expleam, Accius 125; evertens erigit, ib. 130; spernens incilans indecorans differet, ib. 130; configit stans (?), ib. 135; agunt vigilantes, ib. 140; venerans invoco, ib. 142; venit fugiens, Afran. 163; plorans obsecrans defetigarem, ib. 166; ausculto lubens, ib. 167; imbuens veneravit, Matius 181; bacchans caedit, Varro 202; clamitantes confirmant, ib. 205; conscribillarunt pingentes, ib. 211; subduxerant vomentes, ib. 211; murmurantes dicunt, ib. 217; coegerunt libantes, ib. 219; pudentes vixere, ib. 222; is sequens, ib. 222; subrigit transfigens lanians cruentans, Cicero 225; effers loquens dicens, ib. 226; frequentans caneabat, ib. 228; torpentes obstipuistis, ib. 231; maerens errabat suum cor edens vestigia vitans, ib. 231; paventes adnectunt, ib. 232; inserens perrupit, ib. 232; lacerans dilaniat, ib. 232; excipio anquirens, ib. 233; urgens haurit, ib. 233; penetrans pervertet, ib. 236; hortantes conclamarunt, Varro Atac. 247; coercens docet—fingitque morando, Varius 259.

2) amploctens oraret, Liv. And. 9; se fligit cadens, ib. 11; sedens pinxit, Naev. 24; restant fodantes, Enn., Ann. 259; induvolans abstulit, ib. 446; postulat pacem petens obsecrans, ib. Fab. 5; avent exspectantes, ib. 14; superat stellas cogens, ib. 48; adveniens auxilium peto, ib. 115; errans efferret pedem, ib. 225; fatigans artus distraham, Pac. 79; exuberans radit, Accius 133; solebat edere compellans, Lucilius 151; coronam gerit afficiens, Varro 203; iurgare coepit dicens, ib. 215; relaxans sacraستي, Cic. 229; volutans promebat, ib. 229; inhaerens lacerat, ib. 223; frendens efflavit, ib. 234; suspiciens decerpsit, Varro Atac. 249.

3) conferre queant sedentes atque soedantes, Naev. 28; tosamque tenentes parerent, Enn., Ann. 241; exspectans pervixi, Accius 126; refice conserens, Matius 181; eruperant venti secum ferentes tegulas, Varro 211; placantes vidimus, Cic. 230; stantes vidimus, ib. 231; avolans adulat, ib. 232; peragrans expuli, ib. 233; capiens edidit, Varro Atac. 246; lustrans saevit—sectatur, Varius 258.

4) aspectabat exspectans, Enn., Ann. 369; incipio temptans, Pac. 74; nuncupantes conciebant, ib. 79; expetens excies, Accius 121; vagent ruspantes sectantes, ib. 128; constiteram salutans, Catulus 173; volabat petissens, Cic. 228.

§16.—For Plautus I have gathered examples from the *Amphitruo*, *Mostellaria*, *Pseudolus* and *Rudens*, and have then turned up with the Lemaire index all the participles found in these plays, with the conceivable antonyms and synonyms of *infitias*, for the other plays. For Terence I have turned up in the Westerhov index all the conceivable synonyms of *infitias*.

§17.—*B.* For Plautus and Terence I adopt another line of classification.

I. Appositive participles with verbs of motion. Examples: *veniunt flentes*, Amph. 256; *non lubens relinquo neque abeo*, ib. 531; *recessim metuens pueris mihi formidans*, ib. 1112; *balitantes eunt* (so Leo and the MSS), Bacch. 1123; *flens abiit*, Cist. 123 (132?), 192; *expectatus veniam*, Most. 441; *surgunt poti*, Ps. 296; *it incenatus*, ib. 845; *transversus non proversus cedit*, ib. 955; *praedatus ibo*, ib. 1238; *redimus salsi lautique*, Rud. 30; *aversa it*, ib. 175; *ibant diversi*, ib. 1252; *praedatus ibo*, ib. 1316; *incessi ludibundus*, Most. 1275; = 6 pres. ptcs., 9 past ptcs., and 1 verbal in *-bundus*.

II. Appositive ptcs. to verbs of emotion, thought, utterance, joined with miscellaneous verbs. Examples: *amplectimur egentes*, Rud. 274; *eiulans conqueritur maerens*, Aul. 727; (*eiulans*, v. *plorans*;) *occidis fabulans*, Men. 922; *flentes amplexae tenent metuentes*, Rud. 500; *flens obsecravit*, Trin. 154; *lacrumans auscultabat*, Bacch. 981; *expetit lacrumans*, Ps. 44; *obsecramus aram amplexantes lacrumantes*, Rud. 695; *loquens lacerat*, Asin. 291; *parsissem lubens*, Ps. 5; *ausculto lu.*, ib. 523; *traxi* —, Rud. 459; *conspecto* —, ib. 869; *amplector* —, ib. 1175; *mendicans interit*, Bacch. 950; (*maerens*, v. *eiulans*; *metuentes*, v. *flentes*;) *mussans conloqui* (hist. inf.), Merc. 49; *obiurgans rapio*, Trin. 680; *obsecrans concredidit*, Aul. 6; *obsecrans amplexa est plorans*, Cist. 567; *infit postulare plorans eiulans*, Aul. 318; (*plorans*, v. *obsecrans*;) *temptat sciens*, Amph. 661; *vis sciens*, Ps. 92; *peccavi insciens*, ib. 842; *supplicans inveniet*, Rud. 26.

III. Phraseological: 1) *adveniens*—*accipiar*, Amph. 161; — (*faciam ut*) *offendas*, ib. 613; — *offendi*, ib. 713; — *salutavisti*, ib. 800; — *adiecisti*, Most. 570; — *perterrituit*, ib. 1136; — *dedi*, Ps. 1201; — *salutem*, Rud. 1275; — *complector*, ib. 1277; 2) *vigilans*, — *vidi* — *munc video*, — *fabulor*, *vigilantem me vigilans contudit*, Amph. 623-4; — *somniat*, ib. 697; — *fabulor*, ib. 618; — (*sc. vidi*), ib. 720; — *dormiat*, Ps. 386.

IV. Miscellaneous: *scibus accubans*, Ps. 1037; (*amplexantes*, v. *lacrumantes* in II;) *plexus cubat amans obsequens*, Amph. 290; *bene merens hoc abstuli*, Most. 878; (*obsequens*, v. *amans*;) *caedere pendens*, Most. 1167; *properans exsolvi*, Rud. 367; *solens fecero*, Amph. 197; — *exanimatus gestas*, Ps. 10; *dormimus incenati*, Rud. 302.

The above examples, which lay no claim to completeness, form an imposing array of appositive participles in Plautus. In I there are six examples of the pres. ptc. appositive to the subject of a verb of motion, all of which indicate an emotion of the moving subject. I have presented under II ptcs. of emotion and nearly related categories. The notion of denying combines emotion with utterance. I claim that between *abit flens* 'goes off weeping' and *it infitians* 'goes protesting' there is a very slight remove of meaning.

§18.—I now present some examples from Terence under the joint class I-II, arranged in the alphabetical order of plays.

venit saepe *clamans*, Ad. 60; venit *lacrumans orans obsecrans fidem dans iurans se—ducturum* etc., ib. 472; prodeo nil *suspicans*, And. 116; venit *clamitans*, ib. 143; aderit *supplicans*, Eun. 811; saepe *obsecrans* veniet, Heaut. 725; me corripui *suspicans*, Hec. 365; praecucurrit *nuntians*, ib. 371 (cf. venio *nuntiatum*, Phorm. 906); corripui me *lacrumans*, ib. 377; accidit *lacrumans*, ib. 379; intervenit *lacrumans*, Phorm. 92.

The Latinity of *infitians it* seems to me amply warranted for Terence.

§19.—I now repeat a few examples from Ennius and the authors treated above in *A*, arranged this time more according to the classification of *B*.

I. *a*) The pres. ptc. with (constructive) verbs of motion, showing the manner or purpose of the motion: se fligit *cadens*, Liv. And. 11; *errans* efferret pedem, Enn., Fab. 255; venit *fugiens*, Afranius 163; *praecipitans* cadit, Pac. 89; vagent *ruspantes sectantes*, Accius 128; is *sequens*, Varro 222; *vehentem* venisse, Liv. And. 8. *b*) Pres. ptc. of (emotional) utterance with verbs of motion: (*vitulantes* nos mittat, whence I infer *vitulantes* imus, Naev. 18;) exhibant *flentes abeuntes*, ib. 26; certantes miscent inter se *minitantes*, Enn., Ann. 278; *maerens* errabat etc., Cic. 231. *c*) Miscellaneous ptc. with verbs of motion: eruperant *ferentes*, Varro 211; *gubernans* veget, ib. 215; subrigit (*se*)—*transfigens lanians cruentans*, Cic. 225.

II. Ptc. of emotion or emotional utterance with miscellaneous verbs: *amplotens* oraret, Liv. And. 8; postulat pacem *petens opsecrans*, Enn., Fab. 5; solebat edere *compellans*, Lucil. 151; *clamitantes* confirmant, Varro 205; iurgare coepit *dicens*, ib. 215; *frendens* efflavit, Cic. 234; *hortantes* conclamant, Varro Atac. 247; *murmurantes* dicunt, Varro 217.

§20.—The examples I have presented justify, in my opinion, the following conclusion: *infitians it* 'goes protesting' as an expression of emotional utterance, accompanied, perhaps, by gesture, is a parallel with *flens abit* 'goes weeping' (Naevius and Plautus), *venit iurans* 'comes protesting' (Terence). We may also note the inscriptional example *redicit triumphans* (C. I. L. I 542—of 146 B. C.), which reappears in the form *erupit triumphans* (Cic., Mur. 51). Wherefore the Latinity of *infitians it* is not to be incontinently rejected.

§21.—If we may accept the syntax of *infitians it*, the next question is as to its form. Here we might defend either of two propositions: 1) *infitias* is purely a Latin byform of *infitians*, or 2) *infitias* is an inherited participial form.

§22.—A mere surface discussion of 1) would perhaps be enough for our purpose, the mere citation of forms like *decie(n)s, quo-*

tie(n)s, etc. The point of prime importance here is the isolation of *infittias*. We have seen that practically all the examples are sg. and, to take my theory for granted, nominative. What is the significance of this fact? The writing of *infittias* for *infittians* is possible because the examples are all sg.; the examples are not (primarily) sg. because *infittias* comes from *infittians*. This is borne out by the usage of the synonymic and antonymic verbs: Plautus uses *nego -as -at* some 55 times, but *negamus -atis -ant* only 6 times, while of the entire verb he has 90 sgs. and but 8 plurals; *aiebam -as -at* 45 times, plural 8 times. Terence uses *nego -as -at* 21 times and *negant* 3 times, *aiebas*, etc., 7 times and the plural 3 times. It was the great preponderance of the sg. in the use of this group of verbs that furnished the necessary isolation for the form *infittias* to develop, or haply survive, in place of *infittians*.

§23.—What was the inherited form of the nom. sg. masc. pres. ptc. in Italic? This question we must now debate.

§24.—Before entering upon it, let us look at the form *praegnas* (Plautus) alternating with *praegnans* (later Latin). It is first to be observed that this word is to all intents and purposes *femininum tantum*. So we must operate either with *praegnati-* or *praegnanti-*, both types which may be vindicated for the Aryan period. Did Latin inherit both types, or only one? If only one, then *-n-* has either been inserted in *praegnans* or lost in *praegnas*. In the interests of classification, which is a large part of science, I prefer to set up the following theory: The inherited form was *-gnanti-*, which lost its *-n-* in the nom. *-gnās*, and in the time of Plautus the *-n-* that was lost in the nom. fell out dialectally also in the oblique cases. The facts of usage in Comedy agree with *apriori* probability that *praegnas*, *gravidam est* (in O. O. *gravidam esse*) and *praegnatem*, *gravidam fecit* comprise the range of usage of these words. If the nom. *praegnas*, derived, we will say, from *praegnans* by phonetic process, was commoner than any or haply all other forms, then the loss of *-n-* in the nom. may well have been extended to the oblique cases. The man and woman's *praegnas est* was, we may suppose, commoner in the conditions of actual life than the man's *praegnantem feci*.

§25.—There is no cogency of proof here, but we gain a point of view: the possibility of the intrusion of the nom. into the oblique cases. In view of their possible bearing on the form *infitia(n)s* I have noted the following conceivably synonymic words, selected without any conscious exclusions or inclusions to effect the results: *cogilans, curans, cupiens, eiulans, fabulans, flens, lacrumans, laetans, laetificans, loquens, maerens, mussans, obiurgans, obsecrans, plorans, supplicans, venerans*—for these words the nom. sg. occurs in Plautus and Terence 34 times, over against 17 occurrences for all other cases. The form *sciens* occurs 12 times, and all other cases but 4 times.

§26.—This word has led me to an inquiry into the behavior of *vidvāns* in the Rig-Veda and of *εἰδῶς* in Homer. For *vidvāns*—the figures are as follows: nom. sg. 98 times, the *-vāns*-cases only 8 times, and the *-us*-cases 20 times. In Homer *εἰδῶς* occurs 45 times, to 42 occurrences of all other forms. In a fairly complete count of pf. ptcs. act., so far as Grassmann's index does not fail me, the Rig-Veda has some 146 nom. sgs. masc., 22 vocs. in *-as*, 5 *-vat*-cases, 27 *-vāns*-cases and 207 *-us*-cases. Notable is the behavior of certain ptcs.: thus, *cikitvāns* has 32 nom. sgs., 11 vocs., 2 *-vāns*-cases and 11 *-us*-cases; the opposite pole is reached by *dāçvāns*—5 nom. sgs., 11 *-vāns*-cases and 133 *-us*-cases.

§27.—Typical cases for the compv. (but *quasi*-participial) suffix in R.V. are *yājyāns*, nom. sg. masc. 15 times, no other form; while *jyāyāns* has 7 nom. sgs., 3 voc., 2 neut. sgs., 1 *-yāns*-case and 2 *-yas*-cases. At the other pole is *nāvīyāns* with 3 (2) nom. sgs., 12 neut. sgs., 15 (16) *-yas*-cases.

§28.—If we build on the great preponderance of the nom. sg. masc. in the word for 'knowing' we can set up a theory of the suffix of the pf. ptc. act. less complicated than those now current and not less in accord with the testimony of the extant languages. Let me assume what I shall presently undertake to demonstrate: the primitive speech had three forms of nom. sg. masc. to the pf. ptc. act. (and compv.) stems, viz. 1) *-WāNS, -YāNS*, 2) *-WāS, -YāS*, 3) *-WāN, -YāN*. The Skr. acc. sg. masc. in *-vānsam, -yānsam* represents the intrusion of the Skr. nom. *-vāns, -yāns* into the oblique cases, and so in Greek the oblique cases in *-ιωv* are the creation of the nom. *-ιωv*, but affected in quantity by other

types. Gk. εἰδώς has the nom. -WāS and Lat. *melior* shows -YāS; βελτίοσι (for *βελτίοσσι) and Lat. *melius* show -YāS. The Skr. -vat-cases and Gk. -or- (for -For-) testify either to an original stem in -WāNT- or to the intrusion of the pres. ptc. into the territory of the pres.-pf. ptc. If -For- stands for -Fovr- (? Fγr, with vowel altered by assimilation), as I believe, it lost its -n- under the influence of the nom. in -Fós. That the -s- of these formations is the nominative -s that has intruded into the stem may be a new way of looking at the facts now under discussion, but it is just what all have agreed to do when Skr. *lé-bhyas lé-bhis lé-ṣām lé-ṣu* are explained to contain a nominative *te-*, rather than a stem TA-. Of course, the Vedic (and Avestan) nom.-acc. plur. in -āsas to -ā-stems (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, II, §314, Anm. 2, citing Bopp) are similar thematizations of cases already complete. This line of explanation is of convenient application to the Skr. abl. in -at-as (cf. the author in Am. Jour. of Phil. XV 416). Another beautiful case is furnished by the acc. *im-ám* in Sanskrit, which we may regard as a doubled acc. (cf. Brugmann, l. c., who calls -am a 'particle'), from which as a source the 'stem' *imá-* extended itself over the acc. of all numbers and the nom. dual and plural (cf. in Latin *ipsum*, which has probably ousted *eumpse*). The acc. *amám* may also be looked on as *um* (acc. to the demonstrative stem U-) plus -am arranged in reversed order. This is also a way of looking at such phenomena as Gk. πειθήνα : πειθήν, ἀγῶνα : ἀγών. For similar phenomena v. Buck's satisfactory discussion of 'Brugmann's Law' in Am. Jour. of Phil. XVII 447 seq.

§29.—The -us-cases have so far not been accounted for by my theory. To do this I will not resort to the explanation by vowel-gradation, for what is that but an observed order of phenomena, a classification, a labelled pigeon-hole in the worker's card-catalogue of memorabilia? I note that we have in Sanskrit a suffix -ú- that has a plainly participial value, and is specially attached to reduplicated verb-forms (cf. Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, §1178), e. g. *cikitú-s* 'knowing' and *jigyú-s* 'conquering,' alongside of which stand the ptc. stems *cikitús-* and *jigyús-*. I can see no particular reason why we should not explain the acc. plur. in -usas as on a footing with the ending -āsas of -ā-stems already mentioned. Inasmuch, however, as Vedic *manú-*, *mánus-* and *mánuṣa-* lie to our hand, while Lat. *pecus-* corresponds to Skr. *paṣú-* (cf. also Skr. *āṅgīras-* beside Gk. ἀγγελος), we need not scruple to put -ú-

and -US-stems into the same paradigm. To me the simplest and, in the light of such cases as I have already mentioned, the most probable explanation of this variety of stems lies in the assumption that nominative -s became thematic -s-, extended subsequently to -s-o-.

§30.—The above explanations admit of the following summary: The primitive pf. act. ptc. suffix was -WāNT-, itself the result of a contamination of a participial-like -ú-stem with the pres. ptc. suffix -āNT-. Its Aryan nom. was -WāNS, alternating with -WāS and -WāN; the -N- lost in the nom. -WāS was also lost in the 'middle' stem -WāT-; the stem -US- is the original -U-stem extended by an -s that may have been taken over from the -WāNS-cases (themselves but extensions of the nom. in -WāNS), but more probably containing the nominative -s of the -ú-stem.

§31.—The nom. sg. endings assumed above are not in accord with present-day teaching. They seem to me, however, to be warranted by the facts. Two of them are found as euphonic varieties in Sanskrit and the other is warranted by Greek and Avestan. A great deal of force is wasted and a great deal of ingenuity misused in the attempt to refer multiple recorded forms to unique reconstructed bases. However consistent an arrangement may be made of the materials, such is the probability that all sorts of flexional levellings had already begun in the primitive speech—which levellings may or may not have been completed in the derived languages before the historical record begins—that the best verdict is often a *non liquet* even where scholars loudly proclaim their *liquet*. What is to tell us that variations shared by several of the separate languages—or conceivably even a variant offered by a single language—do not reach back to the primitive period?

A favorite method has been to take the sum of all the recorded forms as the base. An illustration of this is the nom. sg. masc. of the pres. ptc. This is reconstructed as -ONTS, though the T¹ has no existence out of Germanic, and no one, I presume, will make it a matter of conscience to deny the possibility—nay, even probability—that Goth. *frijonds* may have picked up its -d- from

¹ It may be objected that in Sanskrit a *t* was inserted in sentence-euphony between -n and s-, but the reply to this is simple: -n + s- are heterosyllabic, while -NS of the ptc. ending was tautosyllabic.

the acc. *frijond*, after the pattern of *vulfs* (nom.) to *vulf* (acc.). And, indeed, it seems most unlikely that *-NTS* in primitive Germanic could have become anything but *-nss* (cf. Brugmann, l. c., I², §794 *d*, and Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gramm.*, §178).

§32.—A mistake of method in the other direction is the supposition that the differences that obtain, for example, in the forms of the *-MāNT-* and *-WāNT-* stems, on the one hand, and the *-āNT-* stems on the other—for to the pres. ptc. let us now direct the discussion—prove the thoroughgoing differentiation of those stems in the primitive speech. I have no disposition to dispute the proposition that languages do not go out of their way to avoid the risk of confusing words or even categories; but, on the other hand, the whole history of 'doublets' seems to have been that different forms have been made available to express different ideas. I can not but believe that all such phenomena as the Sanskrit ptc. *bhāvan* 'being' alongside of *mahān* 'great' (cf. *bhāvān* 'your honor') are due to secondary adaptations. I feel free, then, in the following list of forms to treat the *-MāNT-* and *-WāNT-* stems as mere varieties of the *-āNT-* stems.

I now present the forms that make me affirm the three endings *-āNS*, *-āS*, and *-āN* for 1) the acc. plur. of *-ā-* stems; 2) the nom. sg. masc. of *-NT-* stems, and 3) the nom. sg. masc. pf. ptc.

A. The forms in *-āNS*.

1) Skr. *devāṅ*, Av. *yasnaṣ-ča*, Gk. (Cretic) *λύκους*, *λύκουσ*, O.Prus. *deiṵans*, *rankans*, O.Bulg. *raby* (?), Lat. —, Umbr. *vittuf*, Osc. *viass*.

2) Skr. *mahāṅ*, *bhavaṅṣ-ca*, Av. *vyas-ča*, Grk. *δοούς*, Lith. *vežāṣ*, O.Prus. *sīdans*, O.Bulg. *bery* (?), Lat. —, Umbr. *traf*, Osc. —.

3) Skr. *vidvāṅ*, Lith. *miręs*, O.Prus. *elskīans* (? Osc. *deivatuns*).

B. The forms in *-āS*.

1) Skr. *sēnās*, Av. *zaoḍrā*, *daēnās-ča*, Gk. *χόπας*, Lith. *rankās*, Lat. *equas* (?).

2) Skr. *bhavas* (voc.), [? cf. *tirās* 'crossing,' adv.] Av. *amavā*, *bər'zō* (voc.), Gk. *στάς*, [? Lat. *infītiās*, Umbr. *nuvis* 'noviens,' Osc. *pomtis* 'quinquiens.']

3) Skr. *cikitvas* (voc.), Av. *vīdvā*, Gk. *ειδώς*, Osc. *sīpus* (?), [Lat. *mor-t-uus*?.]

[I propose also for the compv. to interpret nom. sg. masc. *πρῶος* (*πρῶος*) as the same word with the Skr. voc. *prēyas* 'loving,' while

fem. *πραεία* is the same as *preyasī*. The Ionic forms *πρηύς*, etc., are modelled on *γλυκός*, fem. *γλυκεία*. If **πρῆιφος* be the base of *πρῆος*, as Prellwitz thinks, then not only is the Greek base unique, but the gen. plur. *πραέων*, dat. *πραέσι*, nom.-acc. *πραείς*, neut. *πραεία* have all gone astray; neither is there any special call for the fem. in *-εία* to an *-o*-stem. The assumption that *πρῆος* is a voc.-nom. in *-yos* (= Skr. *preyas*) accounts for the syncretism of the Attic paradigm perfectly, and the analogy of *γλυκός γλυκεία* accounts for the Ionic paradigm both morphologically and semantically.]

C. The forms in *-āN*.

- 1) Skr. *devān*, Av. *haomā, daēvan*, O.Bulg. *vlūky* (?).
- 2) Skr. *mahān*, Av. *hā*, Gk. *φέρων, λαβών*, O.Bulg. *bery* (?),
[? Lat. *eo(n)*.]

§33.—The above forms warrant us, in my opinion, in the inference that the primitive speech had three euphonic forms for the nom. sg. masc. of the pr. ptc. Brugmann, who accepted *-ŌN* in the first edition of the *Grundriss* (II, §125), has since discarded it (Griech. Gramm., §72), but the forms cited under C. 2) seem to me to meet their best explanation in that way. This assumption is also applicable to Latin. For *flexuntes* and *euntes* I infer noms. **flexo(n)* and *eo(n)* with vanishing final *-n* (cf. Vergil's doublets *Tarchon* and *Tarcho*). The flexional type of the borrowed proper names *Acheruns* and *Aruns* I suspect to have been modelled on *euntis*: **eon-s*, in which *-s* was an Italic addition to the form.

§34.—We may now return to the form *infītias*. We should not be without the warrant of Avestan, and to a less extent of Sanskrit and Greek forms, if we saw in *infītias* an inherited ending *-āS*. Osc. *staiēf*, if a pr. ptc. (and this seems doubtful, for *staiēffud*¹—divided at the end of the line, it is true, but without the point of separation—is the epigraphic reading, and it is at least possible that *-ff-* is the perfect sign, and *-ud* an impv. ending loosely attached, much as Skr. *-tāt* is merged at least once with the middle ending *-dhvam* to make *-dhvāt-*, cf. Whitney, l. c., §570 d) is to be explained, not from prim. *-NS* which would yield *-ss*, and not from *-NTS* which would most likely yield *-nz*, but

¹With *u* and not *ū* in an impv., as in C. A. (cf. von Planta, Osk.-Umbr. Dialekte, §47).

rather from *-ns* with *-n-* reintroduced from the oblique cases. The ending *-NTS* seems also to be wrong for Umbrian, where likewise *-nz* would be the probable product.

§35.—The words from which we might derive the greatest help are Osc. *pomtis* 'quinqüiens' and Umbr. *nuvis* 'noviens,' but their testimony is largely invalidated by the suspicion that their *-is* is an extension to the other multiplicatives of the ending of *b-is* 'twice.' But the phonetics of *nuvis* seem to be repeated in Umbr. *vestis*, if that corresponds, considered purely formally, to Lat. **vestiens* (cf. my article, 'Some Italic Etymologies, etc.,' in a forthcoming number of the *Classical Review*). For *vestis* beside *vestikatu* I note the same type in Lat. *claudens* alongside of *claudicans* 'limping,' *vellens vellicans* 'plucking.'

§36.—All this brings us back to the question whether *-n-* has been reintroduced into the nom. sg. pr. ptc. in Italic after having been lost, either prior or subsequent to the close of the primitive period. The affirmative of this proposition was asserted by Streitberg in I. F. 3, 155, but is denied by Brugmann in the last edition of the *Grundriss* (§414, Anm.), who claims, 1st, that *deciens*, *quotiens* are isolated words; 2d, that *trans* is isolated; 3d, that *-NTS* yielded *-nss* in Latin, a claim that has nothing to do with the case if *-NTS* was never the ending, and which could be conclusively proved only if *-nz* were the dialect form.

§37.—Now, the orthography of *deciens* and *totiens* was a matter of discussion with the Roman grammarians, some of whom declared for *decies* without *n* but *totiens* with the *n*. We need hardly expect to find any genuine record in words thus subjected to the theorizing of the grammarians, for orthography is rather liable to its fashions under such conditions. Did not Lucilius spell *i* in the sg. and *ei* in the plural? And does not Caper spell *cal*s 'materia,' but *calx* 'heel'? It is, in fact, by no means clear that *deciens* is an isolated word, as Brugmann thinks. That *deciens* was liable to the influence of the fully inflected *triens*—and the very spelling *decies* looks as if the grammarians might have been engaged in an amiable attempt to differentiate the multiplicative from the fractional—and *totiens* in its turn to the influence of *deciens* seems to me in every way likely. As to *triens*, its ending is, in my opinion, broadly akin to the suffix of

Skr. *triṅ-çāt* 'thirty' (cf. *viṅçatī*) and more closely to the suffix of Lith. *dėsz-imt* (older *dėszimtis*) 'ten.' There is no great matter in explaining what is a cardinal in one language as an ordinal in another, for *tres tria* filled all the functions of cardinal. It is of course clear that I regard *triens* as an inflected remnant of a large class of numerals turned by usage to adverbs. We are told that Cincius used *triens* for *tertius*. So we may illustrate the specialization of meaning of *deciens* by supposing it to be, like *lubens*, the result of predicative attribution: thus *deciens venit* 'comes tenth' would partly lead us to our adverb, and *venit deciens* (sc. *iter*) accounts for it completely as a cognate adverb.

§38.—As to *quotiens totiens*, Skr. *i-yānt- ki-yānt-* are generally compared for the suffix, and, after all, the prim. nom. sg. may have ended in *-ĒNS*, for certain classes of words (cf. in Lithuanian the pf. act. ptc. *miręns* 'mortuus'). There is excuse enough for this belief in such phenomena as Grk. *αἰδώς*, noun, beside *ἀραιός*, adjective, such a distribution of forms being certainly due to secondary adaptations. I would again not attribute too much reflection to language, but when such phenomena as divergence of accent to correspond with the variation in the 'part of speech' (*nomen agentis* as opposed to *nomen actionis*; cf. Whitney, l. c., §1144, and Wheeler, Griech. Nominalakzent, pp. 70 seq., 78) meet us in modern and ancient languages alike, when diacritics of one kind or another meet us in so many printed languages, e. g. in French *ou* and *où*, etc., English *to* and *too*, and in German *ein* and *ein*: to eliminate altogether the element of conscious control of any language transmitted by writing or print is going too far. Shift in accent we may regard as substantially a diacritic of the voice. I have in mind particularly the type of our *discount*, noun, but *discount*, verb.

§39.—No ptc. form in *-ens*, with the possible exception of *plēns* and a few other second-conjugation ptc., can possibly be considered original in Latin. For the fem. ending *-ens* it is a question well worth considering whether *-NTĪ* may not have been under certain conditions of sentence-euphony assibilated to *-ns* in Italic, just as *-nti-* is assibilated in *Bans-* for *Banti-* (T. B., von Planta, l. c., No. 17), and possibly also in the Osc.-Umbr. 3d plur. in *-ns*. I will suppose, however, that fem. *-ens* represents not *-NTĪ*, but rather *-NTĪ-S*, as in *mens menti-s* (cf. Skr. *matī-s*).

§40.—The *-ns* of the neuter I hold to be almost a proof of the reintroduction of *-n-* into the masc. The vocs. in *-as* to Skr. *-ant-*stems, almost entirely eliminated for pr. ptes. (except in *bhavas* 'your honor,' which has taken on special meaning, and *tirás* 'crossing,' if I am right in supposing it to be a voc.[-nom.] turned neuter, v. below, §43), are fully alive in Avestan as noms. as well as vocs. For the pr.-pf. pte., Gk. *eidós* with (voc.-) neut. *eidós* may well represent a primitive type. For *-YāNT-*stems (cf. Skr. *i-yánt ki-yánt-*, Lat. *totiens quotiens*), the nom. sg. masc. in Sanskrit (and presumably in the primitive period) corresponds to the nom. sg. masc. of the so-called *-YāNS-*stems (cf. above, §28). If we project this back on the primitive period, we may well suppose that beside the nom. masc. in *-āS* was a neut. and voc.(-masc.) in *-ās*. In a word, beside the nom. sg. masc. *STĀS* 'standing' stood a (nom.-)voc. sg. *STĀS*, which form was also used for the neut. nom. This was a parallel phenomenon to the nom. in *-āN* with voc. in *-āN* (cf. in Sanskrit *-mān*, nom., and *-mān*, voc.). When in Latin *STĀS* became *sta<n>s*, then *STĀS* became neut. *sta<n>s*.

§41.—It is possible, though, to view the facts in another light and suppose that *STĀN* and *STĀN* were the noms. masc. and neut. that came into Italic, and that to these a nominative *-s* was added, first to the masc. and then, under the influence of the *-es-*stems, to the comparatively infrequent neuter.

§42.—At the end as at the beginning, we can not say that *infītas* certainly represents an inherited type (nom. sg. *-āS*), accidentally preserved in a locution not liable to the influence of the oblique cases. The same uncertainty is attached to the forms Osc. *pontis*, Umbr. *nuvis*. On the other hand, there is nothing to convict us of error if we claim that in *infītas* an *-n-* has been lost in Latin before final *-s*, a loss rendered possible by reason of the isolation of the locution *infītas it*. This is the history of *sanguis* from *sanguen-s* and *pollis* from *pollen-s*. That *ferens* meant **ferenss* is a mere assumption, based on the other unwarranted assumption that *-NTS* was the primitive nom. sg. ending.

§43.—I have reserved to the end the discussion of *trans*, Umbr. *traf*. Seeing that it has no precise equivalent in any non-Italic language, we have no reason to suppose that it represents an

inherited form. Beside *clam palām* (with iambic shortening) and *coram* we may well suppose a **trām* (: *trām-es* 'by-path' from *trām-* plus *-i-t-* 'going across': no one need cavil because in *comes* 'companion,' *trāmes* 'by-path' *-i-* appears in the nom. as *-e-*, unless he is prepared to reject the *-e-* of *iude-x*), and the extension of this by prepositional *-s* is no hard matter. This is an old explanation and there are plenty more (cf. von Planta, Osc.-Umbr. Dialekte, §§236, 344, and now Flensburg, Die einfache Basis TER, p. 65), many of which do not call for -NS.

For my own part, I believe *trāns* to be a pr. ptc., just as Skr. *tirās* (Av. *taro*), which shows the voc.(-nom.) in *-ās*. Substantially the entire range of usage in Umbrian is given in the following quotations: *tra sate tref villaf feitu* (Ia 31) and *ene tra sahta kupifiaia* (ib. 35); these passages may be rendered 'crossing (the sancta) he shall sacrifice on the sancta three heifers,' and 'then crossing the sancta he shall announce,' etc. Plautus barely uses *trans* and Terence does not use it. The verb *transit* is fairly common in both, and almost exclusively singular. I believe that *transit* is to be regarded as *trans it* 'goes crossing,' though it must have been felt as a compound before Plautus, and *trādit* seems a certain proof that *trans* had turned preposition long before Plautus.

§44.—It is not the etymology of *trans* that concerns us, however. We rather have to show that, granting its origin from a pres. ptc., it is not an isolated word. Brugmann himself holds (l. c., II, §579, footnote) that *intrare* and *extrare* are compounds of **trare*. I lay even greater stress on *penetrare*. I do not think the simple verb was **trare*, however, but rather *terere*, and I see in the locution *viam, iter terit* 'treads the way' a mere remnant of **terit* 'fares.' In compounds this *terere* became *-trare*, cf. *occupare* to *capere*, etc. From *intrans penetrans extrans* the simplex became *trans*. The phonetic reduction of *infilians* to *infiltias* may have taken place long subsequent to the time when *-n-* was reintroduced into the nom. sg. of the pr. ptc. The retention of *n* in *trans* may be due to the syllabification *tran-seo tran-sigo*, while for *infiltias* only one syllabification was possible. Similarly *n-s* in *anser mensa*, but *-(n)s* in *musā-s* (acc. plur.). In Greek as in Latin, tautosyllabic (= final) -NS has a different treatment from heterosyllabic (= medial) -N-S-.

§45.—It is still barely possible to regard *infittias*, Osc. *pomtis*, Umbr. *nuvis* as representing -āS. Then we must explain the acc. plur. of -ā-stems in Italic as from -āNS, while the nom. sg. pr. ptc. was an Italic development that we may represent as -ā<n>s; cf. *scies* 'knowing' in the early Republican inscription from Spolegium, C. I. L. XI 4766, and *lubs*, explained as *lubes* 'libens,' C. I. L. XIV 2891-3.

Let me present at the end a table of contents by way of summary:

- §§1-6. Reasons for dissatisfaction with the current explanations.
 §2, *exsequias ire*; §3, *suppetias adveni*; §4, (*in*) *malam crucem*;
 §5, *pessum*; [§6, *pessumus*.]
- §7. Thesis: *infittias* is *infittia(n)s* protesting.
- §§8-20. Syntactical probability of this thesis debated. (Examples of the locution.)
 a) Generally, §§13-14.
 b) By parallels from Naevius, Ennius, etc., §§15, 19.
 c) By parallels from Plautus, §§16-17, and Terence, §18.
- §§21-45. Discussion of the form of *infittias*.
 Significance of its isolation, §22.
 What was the inherited nom. sg. pres. ptc. in Italic? §23.
Praegnas, §24.
 Preponderance of nom. sg. over other cases, §25.
 Significance of this, illustrated by pf. ptc. act., etc., §§26-27.
 New theory of pf. ptc., §§28-29; summary, §30.
 Euphonic doublets in the prim. period, §§31-32.
 Nom. sg. masc. pres. ptc., and other -NT-stems, §32.
 Three forms of nom. sg.: 1) āNS, 2) ās, 3) -āN, §§32-33.
 Is *infittias* an example of 2)? §34.
 Osc. *staeiffud*, §34; Osc. *pomtis*, Umbr. *nuvis*, §35.
 Is -n- reintroduced in Ital. nom. sg. pres. ptc.? §36.
Deciens, *quotiens*: *triens*, §37.
 Diacritical orthography (or accent), §38.
 Fem. ending -ens, §39; neut. -ens, §40.
 Has -s been added to a nom. sg. in -āN? §41.
 Verdict as to the form of *infittias* a non liquet, §§42, 45.
Trans, §§43-44.

EDWIN W. FAY.

IV.—NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT'S LATIN-ENGLISH LEXICON.

I submit some notes on Lewis and Short's Lexicon.

A new edition would be a real boon to all classical scholars of the English-speaking world. The philological notes would of course need to be largely amended or recast in the light of recent linguistic discovery, and the *corrigenda et addenda* which have been registered in the American Journal of Philology, in the Classical Review, and elsewhere should be incorporated. Messrs. Lewis and Short's work is still no doubt the best Latin-English Lexicon in existence; but there are several points in which it could be much improved without any considerable increase of bulk. Especially should the chronological arrangement of authorities be adopted as far as possible under each of the meanings given for a word. The Lexicon also is not particularly trustworthy in the department of prosody.¹ A defect of less moment, perhaps, is the somewhat capricious treatment of proper names, especially those of fictitious literary personages. To take Vergil's Eclogues, for example—Corydon is recognized, but Alexis ignored; Damon finds a place, but Alpheisiboeus does not appear; Chromis is admitted, but not his mate Mnasylos. Or to turn to Plautus,—of the *dramatis personae* in Capt. only Stalagmus (a comparatively unimportant character) appears in the dictionary: of the characters in Most. only Tranio and Callidamates; of those in Aulul. all are ignored except Staphyla: three only out of eleven characters in Rud. find mention. It is not clear what principle of selection has been followed generally in this class of names. It would be more convenient to scholars if reff. to Plaut. and Ter. were given by Ritschl's numbering rather than by act and scene. The modern invention of *j* for the palatal spirant will probably not appear in any future edition of the work. In the list of authors and their works some omissions may be noticed, such as Sulpicia and the Sat. Menipp. of Varro. Should Octavia continue to be placed under the name of Seneca?

¹Certain of its weaknesses in this direction were pointed out some years ago by Dr. J. K. Ingram in *Hermathena*, vol. IV, 310-16 and 402-12.

Perhaps I should add that my attention was first directed to the errors in L. and S., s. vv. *cacula, celox, cunila, inconcilio, ohe, proficiscor, recommendari, siler, thermopoto*, by Mr. C. Keene's notes in Hermath. III 270-6, on *errata* in Smith's Latin Dictionary, and that Mr. J. J. Beare's paper on Lewis's School Dictionary (Hermath. VII 158-66) suggested, at any rate in part, my remarks on *disiuncte, uolo*, and *ora*. In the case of a very few of the words commented on in the following list, my correction has been partly anticipated in Mr. Lewis's School Dictionary.

Abhinc. L. and S. do not give much information about this word, and what they do give is to a considerable extent incorrect or confused. The ref. to Lucr. 3 should be 955, not 967. That verse is cited under I, as if it was an ex. of the word being used of fut. time; but the remark at the end of II on the same passage is somewhat inconsistent. It might be added that the word is not found in Tac. nor Liv., nor perhaps anywhere in the August. writers except in Hor. Epp. 2. 1. 36 (with *acc.*). Further, L. and S. represent it as used of past time with *acc.* or *abl.* indifferently; but in fact its use with *abl.* is most rare. Madvig (L. G., §325, 2) does not recognize the const. at all. Roby (§§1091, 2) speaks of *acc.* as used 'always' with *abhinc*, and adds "*abhinc* is used with the *abl.* in two passages only (Pl. Most. 494; C. Verr. 2. 52) and in these it means 'from that time.'" Roby here fails a little in his wonted accuracy. Pl. Most., l. c., is prob. the only ex. in extant Com. of the *abl.*; but there is at least one other ex. in Cic., viz. p. Rosc. Com. 13. 37 (qu. by L. and S.), though it is prob. that the const. here has been influenced by an *abl.* immediately preceding. The distinction between *acc.* and *abl.* with *abhinc* is also accurately stated (after Madvig, Bemerkungen, 65) by J. E. B. Mayor on Cic. 2 Phil. 119.

Again, L. and S. give no ex. of the absol. use of the word. Several are to be found in Georges' Latin-German Lexicon.

Further, L. and S. give no ex. from silver or late Lat. of the word, whether in connection with fut. or past time. For the former use add Pall. 4. 13. 9; Symm. Ep. 4. 59 (Forc., Key, and Georg.), and for the latter use (with *acc.*) Vell. 1. 6. 1 and 1. 12. 5, etc.

Acc. to Nettleship (Contributions, etc.) no ex. of local sense is to be found "earlier than Appul." (Flor. 16); but, in the face of this and of other exx. that might be cited fr. Christian writers, the

denial by L. and S. of a local sense can not be sustained. The three distinct meanings are correctly and clearly set out by both Key and Georges. See also Archiv f. lat. Lex. IV 109-15, for an extended treatment.

Under II add to reff. to Plaut. (const. with *acc.*) Bacch. 388; Stich. 137.

Spite of Madvig's clear distinction between the uses with *acc.* and *abl.*, there would appear to be some misconception among scholars as to the construction. It was noticed at the time by some critics that in the speech which the Public Orator of Cambridge University delivered when presenting the Duke of York for an honorary degree some four years ago, the *abl.* construction with *abhinc* was used incorrectly. The same error, strange to say, occurred in the congratulatory address presented by the University of Oxford to the University of Dublin in 1892, when the latter was celebrating her tercentenary.

absque. After quot. fr. Cic. add *dub.* The word is ejected by Oudendorp, Boot, et al. But see Archiv, VI 197-212, and especially p. 202, where the Cicero passage is discussed.

acus, us, f., also *masc.*, e. g. Plin. 26. 5. See Georg., s. v., and Roby, §395.

adiutorium. A ref. to Forcell. might have saved L. and S. from their assertion that this word is "rare." Georg. also adds a voucher fr. Asin. Poll. Fr. Nettleship reproduces Forcell. and Georg.'s authorities and adds Val. Max. Mayor in Journ. of Phil. (XXII 187), in addition to the citations fr. Poll. and Val. Max., gives several exx. fr. Sen., Tert., etc. See also Archiv, X 422.

admoveo. Forcell., Georg., L. and S. all omit the use of this word in Juv. (?) 2. 148 in sense of 'add, include.' This has been overlooked also by Nettleship.

aedicula. Under meaning of *shrine* or *niche for an image* should perhaps be added, although editors differ, Juv. 8. 111: passed over also by Forcell., Georg., and Nettleship. Prof. Mayor in n. on Juv. ad loc. adds a ref. to Tert. de idol. The word in sense of *house, habitation* occurs also in Serv. ad Aen. 9. 4 *Numa Vestae aediculam non templum statuit*. Add to reff. under II Min. Fel. 32. The order of sections I and II should be inverted, as has been done by Nettleship, Contrib.

aevum. In W. R. Inge's correction of L. and S.'s article on this word (Class. Rev. VIII 26), *for* Ov. Met. I *read* II. It may

be added that the pl. occurs pretty often also in Plin. H. N. See Lemaire's ind. and Forcell., who gives a quot. also fr. Arnobius. Nettleship ignores the use.

alica. Add Mart. 2. 37. 6, where the word means some kind of sauce with which a pigeon was served. The spelling *halica* is preferable. See Friedländer ad loc.

**alifer*. L. and S. om. Ov. F. 4. 562 (Merkel).

alloquor (*adloquor*). L. and S. speak of the word as "rare" in class. per. and as occurring twice in Cic. As a matter of fact, it occurs but once in Cic. (once also in Auct. ad Her.); but it is common enough in Liv., though Forcell. gives no ref. to that author and L. and S. but one. See Georg., and Fügner's Lexicon Livianum.

**amigro*. Om. by L. and S.; but is to be found Liv. 1. 34. 7.

ara. Add = *εσχάρα* VI, Lid. and Sc. Priap. 73. 4.

armarium. "Armarium muricibus praefixum, the box, set with sharp spikes, in which Regulus was put to death, Gell. 6. 4 fin." To say that R. was put to death in any such manner is an unwarrantable inference from the passage in Gell. See Hermath. 5. 48 sq.

aspernor. L. and S. om. const. c. *ab*, = *feel an aversion for*, e. g. Cic. Fin. 1. 15.

astrum. L. and S. treat this word very inadequately. The sense of 'horoscope' (as in Hor. C. 2. 17. 21) is not given; the peculiar application of the word in Stat. 1 S. 1. 97 is not cited: its use for Sol and Luna is also ignored. All these are given by Forcell. In the sense of 'dei' the word also occurs in the Aetna, 51 and 68, cited by Georg., whose treatment of the word, however, is not very satisfactory.

Asturicus. Add to reff. Juv. 3. 212.

at. "In Hor. *at* 60 times, *ast* 3 times," L. and S. It might have been added that *ast* never occurs in the Odes.

aufero A. 2. In quot. fr. Ov. M. 15. 292, for *auferet* read *abstulit*.

bipes. Under section I the word where it occurs in Juv. 9. 92 is classified as *adj*. Under section II it is given as *subst*.

bis. The strange expression *bis jungere*, Mart. 9. 84. 9, which apparently = *geminare*, should be cited.

bravium. An alternative form of *brabeum* or *brabium*; recognized by Georg. as well as by Forcell.

bulbus II. Add Juv. 7. 120.

cacula. In the ref. to Plaut. Ps. arg. the first syll. should be marked long.

candidulus. Add ref. to Juv. 10. 355, overlooked by most of the lexx.

carnuficius. The word *carnuficium*, Plaut. Mos. 55, if not *adj.*, must be a *gen. pl.* Neither form is noticed by L. and S.

castrum. An earlier ex. than any given by L. and S. is quoted fr. Plaut. by Serv. ad Aen. 6. 775, *castrum Poenorum*.

catalepton, catalepta. The collection of minor poems ascribed to Vergil. The form is not to be found, *quod sciam*, in any of the lexx., nor is it mentioned by Nettleship. It is vindicated conclusively by Teuffel, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit., E. T., §230*. *κατάλεπτα*, propounded by L. and S., is not recognized by the Greek lexx. (Passow, *Lid. and Sc., Sophocles*).

celox. Acc. to L. and S. of fem. gender only. The masc. is found in Liv. 21. 17 and 37. 27. Add to reff. in L. and S., Gell. 10. 25.

chirographum. Add to reff. in L. and S., Juv. 13. 137 and 16. 41. J. E. B. Mayor on Juv. 13. 137 gives a ref. to Ambr. de Tobia, §24, not registered in lexx.

ciccus. See Sonnenschein on Rudens 580.

coloratus 2. Add Claud. Laud. Stil. 1. 265, *coloratus Memnon*; Anthol. Lat. (Riese) 395. 25.

conclamo. This art. needs to be rewritten and the classification of meanings made clearer. *conclamata*, Mart. 9. 45. 5, is given under III A. and also under B. b. with conflicting explanations, and in one instance with a wrong ref.

conditio (2). The meagre list of reff. might be enriched fr. J. E. B. Mayor's article in *Journ. of Phil.* VIII 16. 265-8. At least should be added '*a conditione Romae*' fr. Oros.

confido. Correct '*fisus sum*'!

coniugium B. 2. Add Juv. 8. 219. Another ex. fr. Ambr. is given by Mayor on Juv., l. c.

conscribo I. *Patres conscripti* expl. as = *Patres et conscripti*. This is almost certainly wrong, as has been shown by Ihne and others.

considium. See *Classical Review*, II 23. Cf. Serv. ad Aen. 9. 4 *ipsa consilia a sedendo quasi considia dicta sunt*.

constrictus. Add Juv. 5. 84. The meaning 'contracted, small' is only late. None but late authors are quot. by L. and S.; but the word occurs more than once in Plaut. (e. g. Truc. 771 and

Pseud. 854) in the earlier literal sense. So also in Cic. de Or. 1. 52. 226. Not that the literal sense disappears in Silver Lat.; e. g. Plin. 11. 65 [*lingua*] *constricta venis*.

coquino. The English translators seem generally to have reaffirmed Forcellini's error as regards the quantity of the penult of this word. Mr. C. Keene (Hermath. III 271) drew attention to the same mistake in Smith's Dictionary. There can be no reasonable doubt as to either the reading or the quantity (*coqu-natum*, *coqu-nare*) in the three passages cited from Plaut.

coralium (*curalium*). L. and S. give no earlier use than Ov. It is to be found also in Lucr. 2. 805.

coturnix (*ō* in Lucr.). Add 'and Plaut.' Also spelled *cocturnix*. See Munro on Lucr. 4. 641.

coxa. Add Mart. 7. 20. 5 *utramque coxam leporis*, *hind-leg of hare*.

cultus B. Add to reff. Juv. 3. 189 *cultis servis*, and 11. 202 *cultae puellae*.

cuminum. Mark with * both Hor. and Pers.

cuneus. Section II gives a very incomplete account of the word as a military term. Several additional meanings will be found in Mr. Louis Purser's learned article in Dict. of Antiqq., vol. I, p. 808 (a). L. and S. also om. use of word for *wine-bin*, Cato, R. R. 2. 3. 2.

cunila. The penult is marked long by L. and S.; but it is short in the only passage in verse where it occurs, viz. Plaut. Trin., l. c. The form *cunela* also is found.

cur. The deriv. fr. *qua re* can scarcely be seriously maintained. The word must surely be fr. **quoi-r* (see V. Henry, Gram. Compr., p. 247).

decumates. Should be marked with *, being ἀπ. εἰρ., as noticed by Orell., ad loc. cit.

defundo I. L. and S. confound with *diffundo*. *Defundo* = *pour into the cups* from the cratera or else *pour into the cratera* for mixing, while *diffundo* = *pour from the dolia* into the *cadi* or *amphorae*. Strangely enough, *diffundo* is quite correctly explained by L. and S., s. v. The use of *diffundo* is abundantly illustrated by Mayor on Juv. 5. 30 (also in Supplementary Notes). Add to the scanty ante-Aug. reff. Lucil. ap. Cic. De Fin. 2. 8. 23.

denarius II A. Only the American reader has been thought of here. Add the Engl. equiv., nearly 8½d.

denixe. The ref. to Plaut. Trin. should be 3. 2. 26. Acc. to Wagner and Georg. the word is attested by Placidus' gloss.

derigo. Has to be looked for under *dirigo*, yet *derigo* seems undoubtedly the form to be preferred. It is supported with weighty evidence by Munro ad Lucr. 6. 823, but see Nettleship, s. v.

detractor. Mark Tac. with *.

detrectatio. Add * Tac. H. 1. 83.

deveneror. Mark with * both Ov. and Tib., and after Ov. add *dub*.

diirectus. In l. 8 for Lorence read Lorenz. The word is marked *diirectus* by Georg. L. and S. do not indicate quantity of 1st syll. Palmer's¹ careful examination of all the passages where the word occurs seems to prove clearly (1) that the first two syllables are long, (2) that the word is always of *four* syllables, not "always" trisyllab., as L. and S. assert, following Brix.

dioecesis. The Greek forms of *gen.* and *acc.* are found, though omitted by L. and S. See Georg., s. v.

Diomedea, sing. fem. *The Geste of D.*, Juv. 1. 53, not noticed. Cf. form *Odyssea*.

disiuncte. The use of the compar. *disiunctius*, Cic. Phil. 2. 13. 32, is not rightly explained. It should be *in the form of a dilemma*.

dismaritus. See Classical Review, II 23.

dissimulabiliter. L. and S. om. Noticed by Tyrrell on Mil. Glor. 260.

donec. "Not in Caes." Add nor in Sall. or Ammianus.

ducto. L. 3 fr. end, for id. read Plaut.

ductus. Add d. litterarum, *the suggestion of the letters*. Add also fr. Forcell., Val. Fl. 7. 167 *tot ductibus*, of the dragon's folds.

dumtaxat II A. 2. Prefix * to Tac.

eia. Sonnenschein on Rudens 339 points out the incorrectness of this form.

ergo. "Rarely with short *o* in the post-Aug. poets," L. and S. But the short *o* is very common in Juv. See Mayor on 3. 281.

euhoë. The peculiar const. with which the word occurs in Cat. 64. 255 (in imitation of the Greek) should have been mentioned.

excipiabulum. L. and S. om. See Serv. ad Aen. 4. 131.

excipio II A. Add to meanings *welcome, entertain*.

exercitus. Add phrr. *exercitum remittere, to send the levies home, and exercitum imperare, to call them out*; e. g. Plaut. Capt. 153 and 155.

¹ Hermath. 5. 65 sqq.

exsanguis I B. Add * to Hor.

facies ad init. For Gell. 8. 14. 1 read Gell. 9. 14. 1.

factiosus. L. and S. render the word in Plaut. Aul. 2. 2. 50 *demagogue*; but it is used in that passage in bon. part. Render it *influential*.

fallo II B. No instance of its use by Tac. given by L. and S. Many exx., both *absol.* and *c. acc.*, are to be found in Tac. See Gerber-Greef.

ferricreptinus: The penult is marked \cup by both Georg. and L. and S.; but see Hermath. II 116.

fidelia II. L. and S. expl. the prov. 'de eadem fidelia duos parietes dealbare' as = *to kill two birds with one stone, to reach two ends by one action*. L. and S. seem to have followed the Eng. tr. of Forcell.; but the context of the passage in Cur. ap. Cic. Fam. 7. 29 (the only place where the expression occurs) agrees very ill with their interpretation. The sense demanded seems to be rather *to make oneself attractive to both sides*. Mr. A. R. Shilleto aptly compares it with Pausan. 6. 3. 15 *κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπ' αὐτῶν Ἰώνων τοὺς τοίχους τοὺς δύο ἐπαλείφοντες*, where there can be no doubt of the meaning. Pausanias's moral is *οἱ πάντες ἄνθρωποι θεραπεύουσι τὰ ὑπερέχοντα τῇ ἰσχύϊ*.

florus. The meagre statement of authorities for *florus* given by L. and S. may be largely supplemented fr. Georg. and Nettleship.

fluvidus in lemm. P. 763 has the first syll. marked only long; but under *fluidus*, where it is given as an access. form, the same syll. is marked only short, and Lucr. 2. 452, 464 sq. are cited as authorities. There is an error here. In l. 452 the syll. is short; but in 464 and 466 it is certainly long. Georg. also fails to notice the lengthening in these two cases.

föcülum. Contr. fr. *fouiculum*, om. by L. and S., who (as Smith had already done) reproduce Forcell.'s error in confounding the two forms *föcülus*, dimin. of *föcus*, and *föcülum*, the word which is used twice by Plaut. (once in Pers. 104 and once in a diff. sense in Capt. 847). There is a misprint in L. and S. in the citat. fr. Plaut. Pers. See Ingram's nn. in Hermath. I 247 sq. and IV 313. Georg. gives an accurate account of the two words.

frigus. Tib. 1. 8. 39 is cited first under I A., and presently again under B. I, each time with a different meaning.

frit. This certain conj. of R. Ellis on Plaut. Most. 595 should be added to the lexx.

fuligo. Add Juv. 10. 130. Yet the sense 'soot' seems hardly to suit *ardentis massae*.

fustitudinus. The penult is marked short by both L. and S. and Georg.; but see Hermath. II 116.

gemmo II A. 2. Also of a brook, Mart. 9. 90.

Graecinus. Tac. Ag. 4 om. by L. and S.

gravidus. Add strange constr. *c. acc.*, *quod gravidast*, Plaut. Am. 878 (if the scene be genuine).

gurdonicus. Gibbeted in Classical Review, V 104.

harena. "Plur. (post-Aug.)," L. and S. A strange statement, in view of the quotations fr. Verg. and Ov. that immediately follow.

haud. Add 'used only once by Hor. in his lyrical poems.'

haurio. L. 6 ab init. *for* Juv. *read* Juvenc.

hic. As marked by L. and S., the vowel of *hic* (pron.) is almost always long; but it is short in Verg. A. 4. 22, in addition to the passages cit. by Ingram, Hermath. 4. 405.

hirtus. The isolated ex. given by L. and S. fr. Ov. M. 13. 850, together with remark "mostly post-Aug.," would lead to the impression that the word has not a recognized place in Aug. poetry. It is to be found 5 times in Ov. M. and Hal., once in A. A. (1. 762) and once in T. (1. 3. 90); also in Verg. G. 3. 55 and 287 (not noticed by Forcell. or Georg.).

ibidem. As to L. and S.'s statement of the quantity of penult in Plaut., see Sonnenschein on Rudens 396.

illic. "Old form *illi*," L. and S. To citations add Ter. Ad. 577 and Hec. 217. Other reff. in Georg., s. v.

impleo. Of its use *c. gen. rei* only one ex. is given (fr. Cic.). An earlier instance is found in Plaut. Aul. 552.

in II C. 7 (fin.). Add *videbo te in publicum*, Petron. 58; *in medium* (*l. dub.*) *relinquam*, Tac. G. 46 (cf. Gell. 17. 2).

inaestuo. Mark Hor. with *.

incedo II B. 1. "To triumph over, exult over; with *dat.*" In neither of the reff. given does the *dat.* appear to be used, but rather the *abl. dep.* on *superbus*, while *incedo* is used in sense I A.

incedo II B. 2. (β) with *acc.* Several of the exx. of the use of *incedo* given here are also cited under *incesso* II, e. g. Liv. 1. 17. 4; 2. 7. 1; Just. 22. 6. 11.

incido I A. Add const. *c. acc.*, Tac. H. 3. 29 *obruitque quos inciderat*. Mayor, on Juv. 4. 39, gives another ex. fr. Plin. The ex. fr. Tac. may perhaps justify us in regarding *sinus* as depending on *incidit* in Juv., l. c.

inconcilio. The art. on this word in L. and S. needs re-writing. The primary meaning is no doubt *entangle, get into difficulties*, as in Plaut. Trin. 136. Id. Most. 613 is cit. under I and again in diff. sense under II.

inferiae. L. and S. give no ex. fr. ante-Aug. poetry. The word occurs in Cat. 101 and Lucr. 3. 53.

insido I B. (β). Add Tac. An. 3. 61 *aram insiderant*; the archaic form of conjugation also deserves notice.

insudo. Mark Hor. with *.

intelligo. Add exx. of its use of feeling the effect of a wound or of medicine, poison, etc.; e. g. Stat. Th. 11. 546 *Mox intellecto magis et magis aeger anhelat Vulnere*; Tac. An. 12. 67 *nec vim medicaminis satis intellectam*.

inter D. The account of the phenomena of this prep. in compos. given by L. and S. is very unsatisfactory and subsection C is prob. quite wrong. The sense of the prep. in such words as *internectere, interprimere, interstringere*, etc., and again in *interfodere, interfugere*, etc., has been overlooked. At least a ref. should be given to Roby's exact treatment of the matter, §§990, 1998-2000.

io. So marked by L. and S. It should be added that the word is sometimes treated as a monosyll. (*Yo*) in poetry. See Ellis, Comm. on Cat. 61. 117, 8.

ipse II A. After quot. fr. Cat. add Inscr. Orell. 4923 *Claudiae . . . Gellius Zoilus issae suae*, cited by Bährens.

irrado II. "*caput irrasum*, shaved, bald, Plaut. Rud. 5. 2. 16," L. and S. A manifest error. See Sonnenschein ad loc.

is, ea, id. No notice is taken by L. and S. of the steady avoidance by the poets of most of the oblique cases of this pron.; e. g. *eius* is not used at all by Verg., only twice (both in dub. lect.) by Hor. in his Lyrics, and only once by Ov. Probably the pronoun in the oblique cases was for some reason thought weak and unemphatic.

iuvenis. Only two exx. given by L. and S. of compar. *iuvenior*; many more exx. in Neue, II 128, 9, to which add Colum. 9. 11. 9.

lampas I. The second cit. fr. Lucr. is wrong; apparently a confusion between preceding cit. fr. Ov. and a ref. to Lucr. 5. 403 *lampada mundi*.

lectus. Nom. pl. in Cornif. ap. Prisc. See Munro on Cat. 57.

legirupio. See Sonnenschein on Rudens 709.

liceor β. Add Ov. Am. 3. 8. 59 as an ex. fr. Aug. poetry.

licitor. L. 3, for *licitare* read *licitere*.

ligula. Its use in App. Flor. 2. 9. 2 of the blade (?) of a strigilis is not mentioned by L. and S. It may be added that the account of the meanings of this word in the new Dict. of Antiqq. is very far from complete.

liquidus. Munro ad Lucr. 2. 452 mentions Laevius and Phaedrus as additional authorities for long *i*. The word is used but once by Phaedrus, 1. 26. 4, unnecessarily corrected by Bentley.

liquor. In ref. to Lucr. 1, for 454 read 453.

longe 2 a. Add Juv. 7. 41 to passages where the word must be taken in local sense.

magūdaris. Correct the quantity. See Sonnenschein on Rud. 633.

manupretium II. Add Front. Bell. Parth., p. 219 (Naber).

1. *manus*, I. Juv. 1. 15 *manum ferulae subducere* is explained by L. and S. *to be too old for the rod*. The meaning is of course *finch from*.

marceo. In reff. Stat. S. 4. 6. 56 and Tac. G. 36 the word is apparently transitive.

matella II. Add Juv. 10. 64.

Mauritania. For the quantity of second syll. see Robinson Ellis on Manil., Cl. Rev. 5. 382.

maxilla. The etymol. proposed is inconsistent with that given under *mala*.

membranum. Om. by L. and S. See Beer, Spicileg. Juven., p. 71. Mayor gives an additional voucher on Juv. 7. 23.

modo. Add *modo modo*, Mart. 2. 57. 7.

moror B. 2. Add to constr. *ut*, as in Hor. S. 1. 4. 13, unless indeed, with Palmer, we wholly reject the verse.

munus II C. 2. The ref. to Juv. 4. 18 is quite out of place and belongs properly to II C. 1.

munus II C. 2 β. Also in sing., Hor. Epp. 2. 1. 216 *munus Apolline dignum*. It is strange that this passage seems to have been overlooked by all the lexicographers, including Nettleship.

nedum I B. Add Hor. A. P. 69, *c. subj.*, *nedum sermonum stet honos*, as ex. of Aug. use in this sense.

nepos B. 1. Fuller reff. in Georg. for meaning *nephew*; but there is no certain ex. fr. any author before 3d century; *sorum nepotes* in Suet. Caes. 83 prob. means *sisters' grandsons*.

Nereine (Νηρηϊνη) should be added (having the support of

Haupt, Munro, Bährens, Palmer), Cat. 64. 28. Admitted by Georg.

ni. The form seems to have been avoided by Hor. altogether in his lyrical poems.

non (π). Add Juv. II. 185.

numqui (adv.). Om. by L. and S. Several certain exx. fr. Com., as well as the doubtful one fr. Hor. S. I. 4. 52, are given by Georg.

nutrix. The form *notrix*, cited as fr. Quintilian, is almost certainly a f. l. See Prof. Lane's n. in Harvard Studies, I 91 sq.

ob. The explanation of this prep.'s force in comp. is far from complete; e. g. the meaning of 'down,' which it sometimes conveys, is ignored. Such a meaning is to be found in *obire*, *obsorbere*, etc. Generally it must be said that L. and S. do not explain very satisfactorily the force of the prepositions in comp. The lex. might with great advantage be enriched in this direction from Roby.

obnoxius. The remarkable use of this word in Plaut. Epid. 695 is not mentioned, and the expl. of *obnoxie*, Plaut. Stich. 497, seems very unsatisfactory. There is great probability in the view taken by Palmer, Hermath. 5. 64.

obsecro. Add ex. fr. Hor., strangely ignored by all lexx., Epp. I. 7. 95 (also in S. 2. 3. 264 in quot. fr. Ter.).

obsequium. The uses badly classified and some of the exx. wrongly rendered. The word is used with both *obj.* and *subj. gen.*; e. g. *obj.*: *obsequium ventris*, Hor. S. 2. 7. 104; *o. aquarum*, Ov. M. 9. 117 (cf. *obsequio tranantur aquae*, Ov. A. A. 2. 181); *Corporis obsequio*, Cic. de Leg. I. 23; *o. alicuius*, Cic. Att. I. 6; Just. 13. 2. In Ov. A. A. 2. 179, L. and S. wrongly render *by its pliancy*; it should be *by gentle treatment*.

To II A. add generally in mal. part.

To exx. of *subj. gen.* add Stat. Th. 6. 772 *o. capitis*.

obtero. L. and S. take *obtritum*, Juv. 3. 260, as used *trop.*; but it is surely much more likely to have its ordinary physical sense in this passage. See the quot. in Mayor's Supplementary Notes and ind. to vol. 2.

offerumenta. Wrong quantity. See Sonnenschein on Rudens, l. c.

ohe. The first syll. is marked short. It is really \simeq ; e. g. in Hor. S. I. 5. 12.

opulento. Mark with * both Hor. and Col.

ora. The interpret. of *oras*, Verg. A. 9. 528, given by L. and S. seems to miss altogether the metaph. as expl. rightly by Conington, Sidgwick, al., of unrolling a scroll.

orbis. The difference in use of *abl. orbi* and *orbe* is not expl. by L. and S. No doubt, as has been pointed out by Mr. L. C. Purser, the *-i* form is purely locative. With an adj. *orbe* would be used. (See Hermath. 5. 296.)

Orcinus. Add to reff. Naev. ap. Gell. 1. 24 *Orcino thesauro*.

os. "volito vivus per ora virum, soon become famous," L. and S. A strange rendering.

paganus. The somewhat meagre reff. might with advantage be enriched fr. Mayor's note on Juv. 16. 33. Perh. some exx. of its occurrence in Tac. (only in H.) should be given over and above its use *contemptim* in H. 3. 24.

parens 1 b (a). Add Juv. 8. 138.

paucus. For other exx. of sing. see Wilkins on Hor. A. P. 203.

pedarius. The note on *pedarii senatores* is quite incorrect. See Dict. of Antiqq., vol. II, p. 625 (a), s. v. *senatus*.

pegma. For addit. reff. see Mayor on Juv. 4. 122, and add to these Sueton. ap. Serv. ad Verg. G. 3. 24.

pegmaris. Add a ref. to *paegniarius* or *paegniaris*, far the most prob. reading in Sueton. Calig. 26.

per. L. and S. ignore the use of this prep. in a bad sense in comp., e. g. *perdo*, *perimo*, *perverto*.

perdo. The use of this word in the *pass.*, Hor. S. 2. 6. 59, is cited by L. and S. as "the only classical example of a *pass.* form in the *pres.*" The statement does not go far enough. This is really the only example of a finite const. in *pass.* that can be found in class. Lat.

perfero. The passage quoted fr. Cic. Cornel. Fragm. to illustrate difference between *ferre* and *perferre* (*legem*) is, as Prof. Wilkins reminds us (on Hor. Epp. 2. 1. 153), of no authority, being only due to conjecture.

periclitator. Add absol. use *to be in danger of prosecution*, a sense common in Tac. Ann. See Gerber-Greef.

periculum 2 a. Cf. Old Eng. *danger* (e. g. "You stand within his danger, do you not?," Shaksp.).

perluceo. "Cretice, perluces, i. e. you wear a transparent Cretan garment." A most comical error.

pero. Add Serv. ad Aen. 7. 690 *pero est rusticum calciamentum*.

persona I. In cit. fr. Juv. 3. 96 the word is wrongly marked as *abl.*

pertracto. Add Tac. G. 11 (Halm, Orell., al.), of *debating, deliberating*. See *praetracto*.

pinguis. "*pingues taedae, full of pitch*, Lucr. 3. 681," L. and S. Corr. to Lucan. 3. 681. The same expr. occurs in Lucr. 5. 296; Sil. 14. 427; Verg. G. 3. 450.

pōns = πολέμοιο γέφυραι, a meaning not recogn. by lexx., but shown by the late Prof. J. F. Davies to be almost certain in Gell. 9. 13 in ipso ponti.

porcellio. Cf. Ital. *porcellino* and Gr. *ὀνίσκος*.

porcus. Given by L. and S. as *masc.* only, but it is clearly *epicene*. See Wilkins on Hor. Epp. 2. 1. 143.

postrēmō. Add *postremō*, Juv. 11. 91.

praecanus. The expl. "very gray," supported by Schütz and others, should also be mentioned.

praefoco. Add Serv. ad Aen. 8. 289, *praefocaverit* (as expl. of *eliserit*).

Praeneste. *Abl.* Praeneste, Juv. 3. 190.

praestigiator. The forms *praestrigiator* and *praestrigiatrix* are to be preferred. See Georg., s. v.

praetracto. L. and S. om. = *προβουλεύεσθαι*. It is the reading of MS C. in Tac. G. 11, and accepted by Nipp. and Ritt. *Praetractatus* also is used by Tert.

premo I ad fin. Correct *premerat* to *presserat*.

principium. Add meaning *initial letter*. *C est principium nomini*, Plaut. Trin. 915.

priusquam. Nothing is said of its constr. There should, at any rate, be a ref. to *antequam*, under which word there are some syntactical notes.

proficiscor. Add that first syll. is long in Plaut. Trin. 149.

profligator. Mark 'Tac.' with *.

promutuor, promutuus. See Classical Review, 6. 257.

propius A. 3. Add Sall. Cat. 11 *propius virtutem*.

propugno. Absol. Tac. Ag. 12.

proximus A. With *acc.* also in Tac., e. g. Ann. 3. 62. 1 and 15. 15. 6. Add Sall. Iug. 49. See Forcell. for exx. fr. Gell. and Liv. Those which he gives fr. Sall. seem to be incorrect.

pupus. Found also in inscrr., as Prof. Palmer reminds us. See Wordsworth, Frag. and Spec., etc.

quadrantarius II. The expl. which L. and S. give of the word

in its application to Clodia, 'who sold herself for a bath,' is curiously ambiguous. The word seems clearly to mean that C. sold her favours for the very small sum of a quadrans, the price of a bath in the public balnea (Hor. S. 1. 3. 137).

que, E. "Equivalent to *quoque* only in *hodieque* (not before Velleius)." How considerably both these statements need qualification will be seen fr. the reff. given by Ellis on Cat. 31. 13 and 102. 3.

quin II 2. Statement as to const. inadequate. See Hermath. 7. 163.

Quinquatrus. Add Juv. 10. 115.

quippe, 5. *Quippe quod vidisset*, Cic. Fam. 1. 9. 9, is given as an ex. of the const. with *indic.*!

quis II A. 2. The quot. fr. Gell. is evidently out of place here, and belongs to an earlier section.

quod. The treatment of this conj. by L. and S. is far from satisfactory. Among other noticeable defects there is nothing said of the common idiom 'quod diceret' *c. inf.*, in which, by a carelessness of speech, the verb of saying, instead of the thing said, is treated as in *orat. obl.* See Madvig, L. G., §357. 2.

reatus. Add Sid. 9. 271; Serv. ad Aen. 2. 102.

**recommentor*. Om. by L. and S., but recognized in Plaut. Trin. 912 (4. 2. 67) by Ritschl, Wagner, Georg.

**refervesco*. Add to lexx. Gell. 1. 11 *refervescente impulsu*. Also remove * in lemm. and prefix to Cic.

repentē (pp. 1567, 8). Correct to *repentē*.

rogo II 2. In the exx. fr. Plaut. and Cornif. the word has its ordinary significance.

sagatio. Om. by L. and S.; but see Georg. and Ducange. Cf. French *bernement*.

sagum. Add Mart. 1. 3. 8 *excusso sago*, of tossing in a blanket, and Suet. Oth. 2 *distento sago impositum iactare*; see *sagatio*.

Sancus. L. and S. omit the form of *gen.* in *-us*, which occurs in Liv. 8. 20; 32. 1; Fest., p. 241.

schema. No notice is taken by L. and S. of the occasional shortening of penult, e. g. Plaut. Am. Prol. 117 and Pers. 463 (Priscian), following, as Palmer points out, Aeol. form *σχέμα* (Hesych.). See Roby, §492.

senatus. The archaic *gen. senati* is of more common occurrence even in Cic. than would appear fr. L. and S. Cic. uses it

often enough in such phrr. as *senati consultum* and *senati populi-que Romani*; see Georg. and Neue, Formenl.

sexennis. In the citation fr. Caes. B. C. the word should be printed in italics, as having been supplied by conj. The MS reading is *sexies seni dies*.

sibilo II. The word is wrongly described by L. and S. as act. in Cic. Att. 2. 19. 2. The error, pointed out by Palmer in his ed. of Hor. Sat., can be traced back to Forcell. and is reproduced also by Georg.

siler. Correct *z* to *l*. (The same error in Scheller.)

siquidem. Occurs in Tac. only twice, viz. Ag. 24, G. 30.

somnus. Add multi somni esse, a heavy sleeper. Front. 93 (Naber).

spernor. L. and S., following Forcell., mark the word as *ān. ēp.*, only Fronto being cited. Add Juv. 4. 4.

suavium. Add Anthol. Lat. 681 (Riese), where *suavium* is disting. fr. *osculum* and *basium*.

sub c. abl. No exx. given by L. and S. of sense *from under*, like *in* c. *gen*. Two fr. Plaut. are given by Forcell., Aul. 620 and Capt. 730.

subduco. L. and S. give no exx. of the prim. sense *draw from under*. In Juv. 1. 15 is a clear instance of this use. Under I B. add, as an ex. fr. Aug. poet., Verg. A. 1. 551; under C. I add Juv. 11. 142.

surrideo. Described by L. and S. as "rare." Add to reff. Verg. A. 1. 258; 9. 740; 12. 829; also in Appul. and Ammian. acc. to Georg. The different constr. *dat.* and *ad c. acc.* should also be given.

synodium. L. and S. om. It occurs in Suet. (?) Fr. ap. Diom. II, p. 489, in sense of 'harmony': *si quando monodio agebat unam tibiam inflabat: si quando synodio utramque*. The Gr. *συνόδιον* in this sense is not recogn. by lexx.

tabulatum. Other meanings and reff. given by Mayor ad Juv. 3. 199. Add to these the uses in (1) Col. 12. 52 for a small store-room or cellar connected with the *torcularium*, q. v. in Dict. Antiqq. II 850; (2) Serv. ad Verg. G. 3. 24, for *stage scenery* (perhaps quoted fr. Sueton.). Serv. seems to use the word in this sense again ad Aen. 1. 164, and ad Aen. 6. 412 employs it as = *fori* of a ship.

tantus II B. b. The last four lines of this section are out of place, having no connexion with *tantummodo*.

Taurubulae. It is likely that this represents the Toro Grande and Toro Piccolo of Capri. See Georg.

tëgillum. Quantity of first syll. wrong. See Sonnenschein on Rudens 576.

tepor. Add use in pl. for *feverishness*, Hor. Epp. 1. 18. 93.

testis. L. and S. om. the constr. with *de*; e. g. in Cic. De Prov. 18. 43 *testis de voluntate Caesaris*.

thermae. "Warm springs, warm baths," L. and S. A very inadequate description this. The term under the Empire came to be applied to establishments which answered also the purpose of the Greek Gymnasia. Often distinguished fr. *Balnea*.

thermopolium. Better *thermipolium*, the Latinized form. See Georg.

thermopoto. The etym. fr. *θερμός-poto* has been rightly challenged. Georg. assumes *θερμopoρέω*, and with great probability.

Titanius. Add Verg. 6. 725 *Titania astra*.

toraria. Render 'nurse.' See Tyrrell ad Mil. Glor. 695. *Torarius* also in gl.

trudis. Add Tac. Ann. 3. 46.

tu. Add to exx. of *gen. pl. vostrorum*, Plaut. Amph. Prol. 4 and Aul. 321.

tutela I A. With *gen. obj.*, omnium tutela, *protection from everything*, Tac. G. 45.

tuus. L. and S. make no mention of its use *c. gen. appos.*; e. g. Tuum, hominis simplicis, pectus vidimus, Cic. Phil. 2. 43.

vacillo. Spelt *vaccillo* in some of the older MSS. See Munro ad Lucr. 3. 504.

vatillum. Om. by L. and S., but the reading of the best MSS, Hor. S. 1. 5. 36. Nettleship (Contributions, etc.) gives several other vouchers.

velarium. Mayor ad Juv. 4. 122 (in supplementary nn.) gives some further exx., partly fr. Georg. Mark word as *άν. ελπ.* in Juv.

vellus. Add Stat. Th. 6. 786 of *the woollen part of the caestus* (though it may possibly refer to the *beard*).

venalis. Apparently in sense of *salesman*, Front. Bell. Parth., p. 219, Naber.

ventosus. Add '*ventosa*' as subst. = *cupping-instrument*; reff. in Georg. Cf. Fr. *ventouse*.

vidulus. Antepenult long (Sonnensch. on Rud. 1).

volup. Abbreviation of *volupè* (Sonnensch. on Rud. 892).

V.—TENNYSON AND VIRGIL.

It is sometimes said that Tennyson is the most Virgilian of modern poets, and indeed his genius seems to be very closely akin to that of his great Roman master. If we mention some of the qualities which are always set down as characteristic of Virgil—his consummate art, the exquisite finish of his rhythm, his spirit of patriotism, his purity of tone, his deep religious feeling, his love for the country, his sympathy with plant and animal life, his great desire to be the poet of natural philosophy—we are naming precisely those qualities which are most strikingly characteristic of his English disciple.

Moreover, the diction of Tennyson shows the constant influence of his Roman "lord of language." One often lights upon allusions and quotations, upon more or less conscious imitations, upon passages where some subtle or unconscious memory of Virgil seems to have determined the choice of a word or the turn of a phrase.

We may begin with the ode 'To Virgil,' written at the request of the Mantuans for the nineteenth centenary of the poet's death:

"I salute thee, Mantovano,
I that loved thee since my day began,
Wielder of the stateliest measure
ever moulded by the lips of man."

It is not necessary to quote or explain here all the allusions with which this noble poem teems, but one can not pass by the glorious comparison of the ancient poet himself to his one "golden branch amid the shadows," *Aen.* VI 208:

"talīs erat species auri frondentis opaca
ilice, sic leni crepitabat brattea vento."

The "Universal Nature moved by Universal Mind," of the same ode, is the "mens agitat molem" of *Aen.* VI 727, and the "Northern Island sunder'd once from all the human race" is the Britain of *Ecl.* I 67:

"et penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos."

Nor should we omit the statement of the new Memoir, II 385, that Tennyson once mentioned the *cunctantem* of Aen. VI 211 as an instance of

"All the charm of all the Muses
often flowering in a *lonely word*."

In 'Poets and Their Bibliographies' we are reminded of the slow and elaborate care with which the poems of Virgil were written:

"Old Virgil, who would write ten lines, they say,
At dawn, and lavish all the golden day
To make them wealthier in his readers' eyes."

The lines in 'The Daisy':

"And in my head, for half the day,
The rich Virgilian rustic measure
Of Lari Maxime, all the way,
Like ballad-burthen music kept,"

allude to the episode in praise of Italy, Geor. II 159:

"Anne lacus tantos; te, Lari maxime, teque,
fluctibus et fremitu assurgens Benace marino?"

The quotation in 'Queen Mary,' Act III, Sc. 6:

"you know what Virgil sings,
Woman is various and most mutable,"

is from the wise dictum of Mercury, Aen. IV 569, "*varium et mutabile semper femina*," and the allusion in Act III, Sc. 1 of the same play:

"Well, the tree in Virgil, sir,
That bears not its own apples,"

is to the delightful personification of the grafted tree, Geor. II 82:

"miraturque novas frondes et *non sua poma*."

The line in 'Becket,' Act II, Sc. 2:

"*Non defensoribus istis*, Walter Map,"

is derived from the words of Hecuba, Aen. II 521, as the similar line in Act V, Sc. 2:

"*Gratior in pulchro corpore virtus*, Thomas,"

is borrowed from the description of Euryalus, Aen. V 344. The closing lines of the poem 'On a Mourner':

" like a household god
Promising empire ; such as those
Once heard at dead of night to greet
Troy's wandering prince, so that he rose
With sacrifice, while all the fleet
Had rest by stony hills of Crete,"

allude to the vision of the Trojan leader, Aen. III 147 ff.

The hesitation of the bold Sir Bedivere, in the 'Morte d'Arthur':

" This way and that dividing the swift mind,"

is literally translated from that of Aeneas, Aen. IV 285 or VIII 20 :

"atque animum nunc huc celerem, nunc dividit illuc."

In 'The Marriage of Geraint,' the description of Enid's sleep-destroying love :

" She found no rest, and ever fail'd to draw
The quiet night into her blood,"

seems to be translated from the story of Dido, Aen. IV 529-31 :

" neque unquam
solvitur in somnos oculisve aut pectore noctem
accipit,"

a passage with which we may also compare, or contrast, the wild pathos of 'Rizpah':

" But the night has crept into my heart,
and begun to darken my eyes."

The attitude of Iphigeneia, in 'A Dream of Fair Women':

" But she with sick and scornful looks *averse*,"

is the attitude of Dido, Aen. IV 362, "*aversa tuetur*," or Aen. VI 469, "*oculos aversa tenebat*." The latter, by the way, is the passage to which Matthew Arnold alludes in 'The Scholar-Gipsy':

" Still fly, plunge deeper in the bowering wood!
Averse, as Dido did with gesture stern
From her false friend's approach in Hades turn,
Wave us away, and keep thy solitude!"

And, to extend the parenthesis, the "in the bowering wood" of Matthew Arnold's poem is the "*in nemus umbriferum*" of Aen. VI 473. The lines in 'Lancelot and Elaine':

"Death, like a friend's voice from a distant field
Approaching thro' the darkness, call'd; the owls
Wailing had power upon her," etc.,

are deeply indebted to the story of one who, like Elaine, "loved him with that love which was her doom"; compare Aen. IV 460 ff., the story of Dido's dream:

"hinc exaudiri voces et verba vocantis
visa viri, nox cum terras obscura teneret,
solaque culminibus ferali carmine bubo
saepe queri et longas in fletum ducere voces."

The lines in 'Teiresias,'

"tramp of the hornfooted horse
That grind the glebe to powder,"

are an obvious reminiscence of Virgil. The second is apparently due to the

"putris se glæba resolvit"

of Geor. I 44, or the

"glæbasque iacentes
pulverulenta coquat maturis solibus aestas"

of Geor. I 65, although Tennyson doubtless had also in his mind the famous "quadrupedante putrem" lines of Aen. VIII 596 and XI 875. The first line is clearly derived from the story of Salmoneus, Aen. VI 590:

"demens, qui nimbos et non imitabile fulmen
aere et cornipedum pulsū simularet equorum,"

a passage that Tennyson was fond of quoting for its fine sound (Memoir, II 12).

The "placid ocean-plains" of 'In Memoriam,' IX are the "placida aequora" of Aen. X 103. The "grizzled cripple" who told the story of 'Aylmer's Field,' and had "been himself a part of what he told," is like the hero of Aen. II 6, "et quorum pars magna fui." The language of 'In Memoriam,' CX:

"Nor cared the serpent at thy side
To flicker with his double tongue,"

recalls the "linguis micat ore trisulcis" of Geor. III 439; Aen. II 475. The "Thou comest, much wept for," of 'In Memoriam,' XVII, sounds like an echo of the "quibus Hector ab oris expec-

tate venis?" of Aen. II 282, and the turn of the phrase in 'The Coming of Arthur':

"But—for he heard of Arthur newly crown'd," etc.,

seems to be due to Aen. I 19:

"Progeniem *sed enim* Troiano a sanguine duci
audierat," etc.

The opening line of 'Love and Death':

"What time the mighty moon was *gathering light*,"

is curiously like Geor. I 427:

"Luna, revertentes cum primum *colligit ignes*,"

and, in 'Enoch Arden,' the shouts of the landing party who "fill'd the shores with clamour" remind one of the companions of Eurydice, Geor. IV 460:

"At chorus aequalis Dryadum *clamore* supremos
implerunt montes."

Indeed the language of Tennyson is sometimes important even for the interpretation of Virgil. In the exclamation of Dido, Aen. IV 11:

"quam forti pectore et armis,"

most editors insist that *armis* is from *arma* 'weapons,' that Dido has in mind only the moral qualities of Aeneas, and that her words mean 'what an heroic soul and doughty deeds!'. But the *armis* may very well be the ablative of *armi* 'shoulders,' and Dido may be speaking of his physical qualities, 'how mighty his chest and shoulders!'. Tennyson's interpretation of the phrase is obvious from his imitation of it in 'The Marriage of Geraint':

"O noble breast and all-puissant arms."

These are the words of Enid as she looks upon the mighty chest and arms of her sleeping husband, and thinks within herself, "Was ever man so grandly made as he?" Again, the editors who puzzle over Dido's last words, Aen. IV 660:

"sic, sic iuvat ire sub umbras,"

and think it 'too theatrical' to make the hapless queen stab herself twice as she utters the words 'sic, sic,' might well consider the

imitation of the passage in the poem 'Lucretius'—the words with which the maddened poet drove the knife into his side—

"Thus—thus: the soul flies out and dies in the air."

Surely the one great poet is the best interpreter of the other.

In most of the passages which have been quoted it is perhaps safe to find the influence of Tennyson's lifelong love for Virgil—"il lungo studio e il grande amore." Like Milton, and like Virgil himself, he has assimilated and reproduced many passages from his great classical predecessors. But, even in cases where one need not insist upon any direct or indirect indebtedness, we have abundant evidence of a kinship of thought and feeling.

Virgil has his own phrase for "tears, idle tears," the "lacrimae inanes" of Aen. IV 449; X 465, or the "fletus inanes" of Geor. IV 375. *Inanis*, it may be remarked, is a favorite adjective with Virgil, as *idle* is with Tennyson. The phrase "so careful of the right," in the invitation 'To the Rev. F. D. Maurice,' is very like the "servantissimus aequi" of Aen. II 427. The line in that "small sweet idyl," at the end of 'The Princess,'

"Myriads of rivulets hurrying thro' the lawn,"

has a curious verbal parallel in Geor. IV 19,

"et tenuis fugiens per gramina rivus";

and the line in 'The Daisy,'

"The gloom that saddens Heaven and Earth,"

has its counterpart in Geor. III 279,

"unde nigerrimus Auster
nascitur et pluvio contristat frigore caelum."

The line in 'The Holy Grail,'

"I heard the shingle grinding in the surge,"

has been compared with Geor. IV 262,

"ut mare sollicitum stridit refluentibus undis."

The language of 'In Memoriam,' XXIII:

"Thro' lands where not a leaf was dumb;
But all the lavish hills would hum
The murmur of a happy Pan,"

and at the close of the same canto :

“ And round us all the thicket rang
To many a flute of Arcady,”

may be compared with Ecl. VIII 22 :

“ Maenalus argutumque nemus pinosque loquentes
semper habet ; semper pastorum ille audit amores
Panaque, qui primus calamos non passus inertes.”

The new Memoir (II 12) tells us that Tennyson used to quote for their descriptive beauty the lines in Geor. III 237-41, where the bull rushing upon his rival is likened to the wave that comes rushing and roaring upon the land :

“ Fluctus uti, medio coepit cum albescere ponto
longius ex alloque sinum trahit,” etc.

The latest English editor of the Georgics explains that the *longius* of this passage belongs to the second line, not to the first, and that the meaning is, ‘and draws its curving mass from the farther deep,’ literally ‘from farther back and from the deep.’ The Latin phrase, or perhaps the translation, reminds one of the passage in ‘Sea Dreams’ :

“ ‘O yes,’ he said, ‘I dream’d
Of such a tide swelling toward the land,
And I *from out the boundless outer deep*
Swept with it to the shore.’ ”

And were it not for Tennyson's fondness for the verb *to draw*, one might be tempted to suppose that it was some subtle memory of this favorite Virgilian simile that led him to write in ‘Crossing the Bar,’

“ But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound or foam,
When that which *drew from out the boundless deep*
Turns again home.”

The lines in the ‘Choric Song,’

“ Music that gentlier on the spirit lies
Than tir'd eyelids upon tir'd eyes,”

at once recall and rival the beautiful lines in Ecl. V 45 :

“ Tale tuum carmen nobis, divine poeta,
quale sopor fessis in gramine,” etc.

The figure in 'The Princess,' part VI:

"Like summer tempest came her tears,"

is like the figure employed in Geor. IV 312:

"donec ut aestivis effusus nubibus imber
erupture," etc.

The simile in the fifth part of the same poem:

"like a stately Pine
Set in a cataract on an island-crag,
When storm is on the heights," etc.,

has been compared with Aen. IV 441, and the figure in 'Will':

"Who seems a promontory of rock," etc.,

with Aen. VII 586 and X 693.

The description of the maiden's speed of foot, in 'The Talking Oak':

"The flower, she touch'd on, dipt and rose,"

reminds one of the description of Camilla, Aen. VII 808. The story of Psyche's "arrow-wounded fawn," in the second part of 'The Princess,' may have been suggested by the story of Silvia's arrow-wounded stag, Aen. VII 500. The stanza in the sixth canto of 'In Memoriam':

"O father, wheresoe'er thou be,
Who pledgest now thy gallant son;
A shot, ere half thy draught be done,
Hath still'd the life that beat from thee,"

is very like the pathetic address to the dead Pallas, Aen. XI 49:

"Et nunc ille quidem spe multum captus inani
fors et vota facit, cumulatque altaria donis:
nos iuvenem exanimum et nil iam caelestibus ullis
debentem vano maesti comitamur honore."

The spirit of 'The Princess,' part IV:

"I hold
That it becomes no man to nurse despair," etc.,

is the spirit of Aen. VI 95:

"Tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito," etc.;

and the sentiment of 'The Lotos-Eaters':

"but evermore
Most weary seem'd the sea, weary the oar,
Weary the wandering fields of barren foam,"

is the sentiment of the Trojan women, Aen. V 614:

"cunctaeque profundum
pontum aspectabant flentes. 'Heu tot vada fessis
et tantum superesse maris,' vox omnibus una."

In "the rainy Hyades," in 'Ulysses,' we have a Virgilian epithet, the "pluvias Hyadas" of Aen. I 744; III 516. In "the aerial poplar," in the later of the two poems entitled 'The Sisters,' the epithet may be derived from Ecl. I 59, "aeria ulmo"; Aen. III 680, "aeriae quercus," or from Catullus, LXIV 292, "aeria cupressu." In 'The Gardener's Daughter' the words, "The steer forgot to graze," may be compared either with Ecl. VIII 2, "immemor herbarum . . . iuvenca," or with Horace, Od. I 15, 30, "cervus . . . graminis immemor." The phrase in 'Maud,' I iii, "Orion low in his grave," has its prototype in Aen. VII 719, "Orion conditur undis," and the same figure is employed in 'In Memoriam,' LXXXIX:

"Before the crimson-circled star
Had fall'n into her father's grave,"

and CXXI:

"Sad Hesper o'er the buried sun," etc.

In 'The Princess,' part I, where a present is described as "a great labour of the loom," and in the 'Morte d'Arthur,' where Sir Bedivere hurls the brand "into the middle mere," or stands "revolving many memories," the classical idiom is probably borrowed from Virgil.

Other parallels as interesting as these might doubtless be cited, but enough has been given to illustrate the influence of the one great poet upon the language and thought of the other. I have tried throughout to exclude the mere commonplaces of poetical rhetoric and imagery. And I have purposely omitted a great number of cases where both the Roman and the English Virgil are obviously indebted to Theocritus or Homer. These passages might better be given in a comparison of Tennyson with one of the older poets.

VI.—THE USE OF THE INFINITIVE IN SILIUS ITALICUS.

Syntactical monographs are too frequently incomplete and inaccurate. A most exasperating example of this was furnished me during a recent investigation of the use of the infinitive in Silius Italicus. The results were so surprising that they are presented here. It will be wise to extend the investigation, as I hope to do, to other authors, more especially the poets of the Silver Age. The following list is the fruit of an independent collection. No attempt has been made to group the words on which the infinitive depends or with which it occurs, save by parts of speech. The alphabetical arrangement, though far from scientific, should prove serviceable for reference.

Schmidt, in his dissertation, 'De Usu Infinitivi apud Lucanum, Valerium Flaccum, Silium Italicum' (Halle, 1881), gives a scholarly treatment of the usage in the three authors. His arrangement of topics and subdivisions is very satisfactory. His wide range of reading enabled him to add numerous apposite quotations outside the authors under consideration. He failed, however, to give a complete list of passages in which the infinitive is found and omitted 100 words with which the infinitive occurs in Silius. I have not yet had time to determine whether his treatment of Lucan and Valerius Flaccus is characterized by the same defects.

The monograph usually cited as authoritative is Schinkel, 'Quaestiones Silianae' (Leipzig, 1884), where (pp. 39-77) all instances of the infinitive (with certain exceptions noted below) are supposed to be cited. Schinkel's treatment of the infinitive is not to be compared with that of Schmidt. The arrangement is poor, the citations in many cases inaccurate, and the proof-reading atrocious. Although the dissertation appeared three years after Schmidt's, Schinkel had apparently not seen his predecessor's work, certainly had not used it. Schmidt has 36 words not found in Schinkel. The latter has some 60 not given in Schmidt. I have noted some 40 given by neither. Schinkel (p. 45) says: "Magnum numerum verborum sentiendi et decla-

randi, e quibus accusativum cum infinitivo coniunctum pendere usitatissimum est, me praetermisisse satis sit indicasse." This is certainly untrue, as many words, which he omits, that are found in Schmidt's and my collections are not "verba sentiendi et declarandi."

In the following list the words starred are given by neither Schmidt nor Schinkel.

Nouns.—Amor, animus, ardor, ars (artis), auctor, capital, causa, cor (cordi), culpa, cupido, cura, decus, exemplum, fama, fas, fides, fiducia, furor, gloria, honor, iactator, ius (iuris), labes, labor, levitas, libido, ludus, metus, mos, munus, nefas, nuntius*, oblivio, oraculum, pietas, potestas, (pro) praeda, pretium, pudor, ritus, rumor*, salus, sensus, solamen, sollertia, sors*, spes, stimulus, studium, tempus, titulus, triumphus, vigor, virtus.

Adjectives.—Acer, adsuetus, asper, audax, avidus, bonus (melior), celebrer, certus, consuetus, contentus, damnatus, dignus, dirus, doctus, dulcis, egregius, felix, ferox, gravis, ignotus, impatiens, impavidus, inadsuetus, inconsultus, indignus, indocilis, ingens, insignis, invictus, laetus, lentus, levis, longus, lubricus, magnus (maior), meus, minor, mirabilis, nescius, nobilis, notus, novus, oblitus, par, paratus, parcus, patiens, pavidus, perspicuus, pollens, postremus, potens, potis*, primus, promptus*, pronus, pugnax, rudis, saevus, scitus, segnis, solitus, sollers, sollicitus, spatiosus, spectatus, suetus, sufficiens, superbus, tardus, timidus, trux, turpis, tutus, tuus, vester*, vetus, victus, vilis.

Adverbs.—Frustra, neququam, parum, satis.

Verbs.—Abnuo, absisto, abstineo, accipio, addo, addubito, adfecto, adfero, adfirmo*, adigo, adimo, adnitor, adparo, adpropero, adspicio, adsuesco, adsum, agito, amo, anteeo, arbitror*, arceo, audeo, audio*, aveo, calleo, cano, cedo, censeo*, cerno, certo, cesso, clamo, coepi*, coepto, cognosco, cogo, commurmuro, compello, comperio*, concedo, conor, conspicio*, consulto, contendo, contingit, credo*, cupio, curo, damno, decerno*, decet, dedignor, deficio, demo, desino, desisto, destino, desum, dico*, dignor, disco, do, doceo, doleo, dono, dubito, duco (dignum), duro, edico, emo, eo, eripio, erudio, est (laudum loco, pro nihilo, in rem), excipio, excuso, exopto, exposco, facio, fateor*, fero, festino, fido, finio, fixum est, fremo, frendo, gaudeo, gemo, gestio, habeo, horreo, hortor, iacto, ignesco, impello, impero, impono, impressum est, incipio, increpito*, indignor, indulgeo, infigo, infio, ingemo, inhibeo, instituo*, insto, intellego*, invenio, invideo, iubeo*, iuro,

iuvat, laboro, laetor, lamentor, libet, licet, linquo, liquet, luctor, maereo, malo*, mando, meditor, memini, memoro*, mereo, metuo, minitor*, minor, miror, molior, moneo, monstro, moror, mulceo, narro*, nego, nequeo*, nescio*, nitor, nosco, nuntio*, obliviscor, occupo, opto, ordior, oro, ostendo, ostento, paciscor, paenitet, parco, pareo, paro, patior, paveo, perfero, pergo, permitto, pernego, persto, persuadeo, pertaedet, peto, piget, pio, placet, posco, possum*, praebeo, praedico, praegaudeo, praesto, precor, probo, profero, profiteor, profor, prohibeo, promitto*, propero, prospicio, pudet, pugno, puto (deforme), quaero, queo*, queror, recuso, refero, refugio, relinquo, renuo, reor*, reperio, repeto, reputo*, scio*, scisco, sedet, sentio*, simulo, sino, soleo, sono, specto*, specular, sperno, spero*, spondeo*, stat, stimulo, suadeo, subeo*, subigo, suesco, sufficio, supersum, taedet, tendo, tento, testor, timeo, trado*, tremo, urgeo, vacat, veto*, video*, videor*, vinco, vito, volo, voluto, voveo*, vulgo.

The following verbs, which Schinkel (p. 77) maintains are found in Vergil, joined with the infinitive, but not in Silius, occur in the list above given: contingit, decerno, desino, incipio, instituo, nosco, permitto, scio.

Bauer punctuates 15, 739: *Ibat consul, ovans maior maiorque videri*. He evidently regards *videri* as dependent upon *ovans*. From a comparison of several passages in which the word appears, it is plain that the comma should follow *ovans*.

In 14, 280, the infinitive follows *furiabant ore*, and in 13, 155, *praevetitum est* is joined with *capital*. Neither is included in the list.

To the list of historical infinitives cited by Schinkel should be added:

1, 248 *Interdum proiectus humi turbaeque Libyssae Insignis sagulo duris certare maniplis.*

5, 33 *Implere et pugnam fugientum more petebant.*

8, 577 *Nunc sese ostendere miles.*

This last is cited by Schmidt.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

What was Ictus in Latin Prosody? By CHARLES E. BENNETT.
Reprinted from the American Journal of Philology, Vol.
XIX, No. 4.

The position taken by Professor Bennett in this pamphlet is a bold challenge to a tacit and almost universal assumption, and, if sustained, involves wide-reaching consequences for scientific theory and educational practice. For it is not a quibble about terminology, whether we define *ictus* as quantitative prominence or vocal stress, but a fundamental divergence of opinion in regard to the nature of rhythm and its application to verse. "In the beginning was Rhythm," says Westphal, and his devout words have at least this element of truth in them, that in rhythm we have an all but universal law of human consciousness.

Perhaps the best starting-point for the discussion will be the positive doctrine which Professor Bennett would substitute for the prevailing conception. It is set forth most logically on p. 371: "If Latin poetry was quantitative, . . . then a dactyl was a long time followed by two short times, etc., . . . absolutely without any other parasitic accretion." Ictus is defined therefore as "the quantitative prominence inherent in a long syllable." The definition applies primarily only to the four fundamental feet—dactyl, anapaest, trochee, and iambus—and not, for instance, to the spondee in the dactylic hexameter. Here the "first long of the spondee is felt as the quantitatively prominent thing in the foot." But have we not here at once a suspicion of "parasitic accretion" in a mental prominence which the quantity does not reveal? But mental prominence is conceded. What is held is that this prominence is not interpreted by a vocal stress or accent, but is only felt in consciousness. Support for this purely quantitative view of ictus or thesis is found, says Professor Bennett, in the Latin grammarians. "These writers in their definitions of arsis and thesis repeatedly call attention in unambiguous phrase to the essentially quantitative character of these concepts." But at this point the argument eludes one somewhat, for there follows from the Roman grammarians not one definition of arsis and thesis, but (1) a definition of foot from Diomedes, (2) a definition of rhythm by Marius Victorinus, with a passage from the same source on the use of characters to indicate long and short syllables, (3) a passage from Atilius Fortunatianus, referring to feet as

moving through the verse *gressibus alternatis*, and (4) a definition of foot from the *Commentum Einsidlense*. But setting aside some logical inconsequence here, since no one of the passages defines or explains the nature of arsis and thesis nor was ever intended to do so, the point of the evidence seems to lie in the words (italicised as quoted) which describe the quantitative aspects of the foot, and it is only for this purpose that Professor Bennett uses it (p. 373): "All these definitions and observations exhibit a striking unanimity in emphasizing the purely quantitative character of ancient verse." That ancient verse was quantitative we did not require evidence to prove. We started, as I understood, to get at the nature of thesis or ictus, on the determination of which question depends the conclusion of Professor Bennett, that ancient verse was *purely* quantitative, i. e. without rhythmic accent. Yet I can not see that these passages, which do not define thesis, and were never meant to, have advanced us beyond the hypothetical assertion from which we started, that thesis or ictus is the quantitative predominance of the long syllable.¹

But to come to the question at issue, the nature of thesis, in a positive way, it would seem to me best to begin with the conception of the foot. Here we can take no better starting-point than the source of all or nearly all ancient theory in the matter, Aristoxenus: ϕ σημαίνόμεθα τὸν ῥυθμὸν καὶ γνώριμον ποιούμεν τῇ αἰσθήσει πούς ἐστιν (Westphal, §16). "That by which we indicate the character of the rhythm and make it intelligible to the perception is the foot." τῶν δὲ ποδῶν οἱ μὲν ἐξ δύο χρόνων σύγκεινται, τοῦ τε ἄνω καὶ τοῦ κάτω κτλ. (§17). Here, then, is the simplest form of the foot, consisting of two χρόνοι, one of which is ὁ ἄνω χρόνος, the other ὁ κάτω χρόνος. In poetical practice (though the grammarians give examples of it) it does not in reality exist, because the rhythmizómenon language does not easily afford a continuous series of short syllables. But we are dealing with a conception and it will serve to illustrate one or two things. First of all there is no quantitative prominence in the form $\cup\cup$, and here at all events the rhythmic effect must be produced by something else than quantity. This could be nothing else than stress or accent, and only thus would it be possible to make the rhythm intelligible (as $\cup\cup$ or $\cup\cup$) to the ear.² For there are only three usual forms of sound rhythm, viz. (1) recurrent intensities, as $\cup\cup\cup$, or (2) recurrent quantitative elements,

¹ In pointing out that Aristoxenus and the Greek theorists made a time division of arsis and thesis (monosemos, disemos, etc.), have we explained thereby necessarily the nature of arsis and thesis? If, for example, we divide a musical bar of $\frac{2}{4}$ time into down-stroke and up-stroke and point out that the down-stroke is $\frac{1}{4}$ and the up-stroke $\frac{1}{4}$, have we given any light, to one who does not know, on the real meaning of down-stroke and up-stroke?

² It might be urged that Aristoxenus, out of desire for theoretical completeness, had assumed an impossible form. But his criticism of this rhythm is not that it is impossible, but that it would have too rapidly recurring σημασία (πυκνὴν τὴν ποδικὴν σημασίαν, §31), which would obviously be nothing else than rhythmic accent.

as $\cup\cup\cup$, or (3) a combination of both, as $\cup\cup\cup\cup$. I have dwelt on this point to show that the identification of thesis (δ κάτω χρόνος) with quantitative prominence is susceptible of theoretical refutation out of the words of the great master of ancient rhythmical theory, whose doctrine is contained in the very passages which Professor Bennett cites to establish his own view.¹

Now, what this teaches us concerning the foot² from a theoretical standpoint is, that it is a definite series of χρόνοι or primary times distributed between an up-time and a down-time, the nature of which is still, let us grant, to be determined. In the dactyl and the spondee the arsis is disemos (or two times) and the thesis disemos, so that from a theoretical point of view there is here no quantitative prominence. The prominence rests with the disposition of the κάτω χρόνος, which may fall on either. It remains therefore for us to ascertain what is meant by the down stroke or time. That prominence of some kind is meant by it is not denied, and we have already seen that in the rhythmic unit $\cup\cup$ it could be nothing else than intensity, whether a subjective intensity, as when we group the exhaust of a locomotive into sets of four (or double two), or a vocal or sound stress when we pronounce such a rhythm and make it intelligible to the ear of another (γνώριμον ποιούμεν). That the nature of rhythm was thus apprehended by Aristoxenus may be pointed out by other illustrations from the fragment of the Rhythmical Elements which survives. Thus §4: οὕτω καὶ τῶν ῥυθμιζομένων ἕκαστον πλείους λαμβάνει μορφάς, οὐ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ. "Thus a given rhythmizome non takes on various forms not by reason of its own nature, but through the nature of the rhythm." In these words Aristoxenus gives utterance to the psychological principle involved above, of the ability of the mind to group the same series of sounds in accordance with any rhythmic suggestion that may be conveyed to it. He continues: ἡ γὰρ αὐτὴ λέξις, εἰς χρόνους τεθείσα διαφέροντας ἀλλήλων, λαμβάνει τινὰς διαφορὰς τοιαύτας, αἱ εἰσιν ἴσαι αὐταῖς τῆς τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ φύσεως διαφοραῖς. "For the same word or group of syllables distributed into different combinations of times takes on such differences as correspond to differences in the nature of the rhythm." Westphal illustrates this point by examples from ancient and modern music, and notes that in Pindar, Pyth. 2, Boeckh divided the initial words Μεγαλοπόλιες ᾧ thus, $\cup\cup\cup\cup$ $\cup\cup\cup\cup$, while Rossbach and himself assumed the simpler form

¹ Diomedes, p. 474, 30: pes est sublatio ac positio duarum aut trium ampliusve syllabarum etc. *Duarum syllabarum* (as the simplest form in which *sublatio* and *positio* can exist) is of course the δύο χρόνοι of Aristoxenus. Cf. Mar. Vict., p. 51 fin. and 52 for *syllaba* (as *metrum*) = χρόνος.

² For the non-musical philologist it may be well to state that the bar in music is the sign of accent, and that the measure, i. e. the space between two bars, is made up of quantitative intervals distributed into accented and unaccented parts (called by the Germans "guter" and "schlechter Takttheil" respectively). Cf. Sir Geo. Grove's Dictionary of Music, under *Bar*, *Measure*, *Accent*, *Rhythm*.

300 300 2, etc. Another example is afforded by Mar. Victorinus in the line quoted on p. 208. In such cases we have to do with a difference of rhythmic effect which nothing but a rhythmic accent or intensity could bring out, for the variation in each case is among primary times which admit of no other principle of rhythmic grouping.

Rhythm may be described as a phenomenon of compensation for fatigue in attention. Attention is not continuous, but oscillatory or rhythmical. That is, the mind seizes upon certain impressions and ignores, or gives less value, to others. In sound impressions this oscillation of attention takes on most commonly the form of recurrent degrees of intensity, as when the roar of a cataract seems to rise and fall in rhythmic fluctuation, or when in attention to a series of impressions uniform in intensity and interval, the mind groups the impressions in accordance with some arbitrary rhythmic suggestion. Such suggestion may be conveyed objectively by the sound impressions themselves, as when any one element of the rhythmic unit differs from the rest in intensity, duration, or even quality (pitch). But of all these elements intensity is the most important, so that even quantitative or qualitative impressions appeal to the mind as variable intensities.¹ This has been shown by psycho-physical experiments, and the close relationship of quantitative differences to intensity may be illustrated by the fact that in recurrent impressions of perfect uniformity the mind not only gives arbitrarily greater intensity to certain impressions, but adds also the sensation of greater duration to the (subjectively) accented element.² Similarly it has been shown that a uniform series of unaccented sound impressions of variable duration (—v or —vv) tend to combine with quantitative prominence greater degrees of intensity, thus, 2v, 2vv. This is true of the simple elements of a rhythmic series, the measure or the foot; but in rhythm as a form of artistic expression the rhythmic series is of primary importance, and here intensity plays a much larger rôle. It becomes thus a question of easy and agreeable 'Zeitauffassung,' of ability to keep in consciousness and to survey as a whole a rhythmic group. In verse it is that feeling which tells us unerringly and without enumeration whether our rhythmical series is complete or defective.³ The importance of variable intensities to lighten the effort of attention or memory,

¹ Cf. Meumann-Wundt, *Philosoph. Studien*, vol. X, p. 283: "Dass unter allen diesen Anlässen [intensity, quantity, quality] zur rhythmischen Gliederung der Eindrücke der intensive Klangwechsel die Hauptrolle spielt, zeigt sich auch darin, dass wir geneigt sind 'die Hebungen und Senkungen der Betonung, durch welche die Gliederung des Taktes vermittelt wird, selbst da anzubringen, wo sie in den objectiven Eindrücken nicht vorhanden sind.'"

² See reports of subjects in Bolton (referred to below), *passim*.

³ Wundt, *Physiol. Psychologie*, vol. II³, p. 72: "Für die Entwicklung und Vervollkommnung der Zeitauffassung ist der intensive Klangwechsel von grosser Bedeutung." And p. 77: "Die Vorstellung der Zeitdauer und ihrer Eintheilung findet daher ihren Ausdruck im Rhythmus."

by subordinating several rhythmical units (feet) to a single main stress, has been recognized in numerous investigations of rhythm in its relation to memory and attention, and it will be familiar to any one who has ever droned the multiplication table or the presidents in sing-song.

These are principles which I believe represent generally accepted doctrines of psychology, but for their verification the reader will find a few references in a footnote.¹

Now, it need not be thought that in accepting this principle into verse we introduce an element of violent stress that shall run athwart the natural word-accents. For as "a difference in sounds which would ordinarily remain unnoticed is sufficient to suggest a rhythm" (Bolton, p. 62), so slight variations in intensity are sufficient to interpret the rhythmic feeling of the mind and to make it intelligible to another. In practice the intensity of the rhythmic accent would depend upon a multitude of considerations connected with the *ethos* of the rhythm, the sensual and intellectual content of the rhythmizomenon, personality, familiarity with the language, etc.

An illustration of some of the psychological principles presented is afforded us by the dipodic measurement of many ancient verses, as a type of which the iambic trimeter may serve. This verse as a purely quantitative series of shorts and longs has the form $\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, with the possible substitutions. But in this form it exceeds the limits within which a rhythmical series can be apprehended and surveyed without great effort, and accordingly the division of the verse into three sets of twos, or dipodies, is not without a sound psychological basis, although it is often treated as a mere fiction of the theorists (cf. Wundt, p. 73, bottom). But what is implied in this division by dipodies? Just as for the eye the confusing line above is made simple by the grouping $\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, so for the ear the long, unbroken succession of intervals is simplified by binding two groups into one. There is but one principle by which such grouping can take place, and that is intensity on the one or the other of the elements of the group, or if the form $\cup\text{---}$ have already a stress, by a greater intensity on one or the other, thus, $\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}$. The ancient evidence for the dipodic measurement of the trimeter will be found cited by Gleditsch (Müller's Handb., vol. II, p. 732, note). One of the most interesting passages is from the Anon. de Musica (97), where series of iambic dipodies with musical notes are marked with the $\sigma\tau\iota\gamma\mu\acute{\eta}$ over the long of the second

¹ For the whole subject see the luminous chapter of Wundt, *Physiologische Psychologie*, vol. II, p. 72 ff. (*Rhythmische Verbindung der Schallvorstellungen*). The experiments referred to are presented by Mr. T. L. Bolton in a very interesting study of Rhythm in the *Am. Jour. of Psychol.*, vol. VI. On $\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, $\text{---}\cup\text{---}$ appealing to the mind frequently as $\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, $\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, see p. 81. On attention as a rhythm of recurrent intensities, cf. Ladd, *Outlines of Descriptive Psychology*, p. 39, and Sully, *The Human Mind*, vol. I, p. 156. On rhythm and memory, see Ebbinghaus, *Ueber das Gedächtniss*, Leipzig, 1885.

iambus. Similarly Caesius Bassus (ap. Rufinum, G. L., vol. VI, p. 555) speaks of the same parts of the trimeter as being the *loca percussionis* and Juba ap. Prisc. says *in his locis feriuntur*. Now I am aware that Professor Bennett attaches no significance to these terms, or any others, as indicating stress, but in the dipody at least, with or without terms, we can not escape the fact that stress or intensity is the only thing that can break up a quantitative series of six into three sets of twos.

The question of terminology has been alluded to, and it will be as well perhaps to turn our attention to it at this point. For Professor Bennett apparently denies that the terms used by the ancients can have any significance in the question, as being merely figurative descriptions of beating time, and beating time he would hold is not stress (p. 382). At first I was inclined to agree with this position, and in a private communication to Professor Bennett I acknowledged that terminology would perhaps have to be left out of consideration. But further reflection on the matter from a psychological point of view has convinced me that this is not so, and that in fact the ancient designations of the prominent part of the foot are clear reflections of a conception of thesis as stress, to which evidential value can not be denied. First concerning *ictus*, it is quite true, as Westphal (and Professor Bennett) has pointed out, that *ictus* is used of the unaccented as well as of the accented beat in the related passages of Diomedes and Ter. Maurus, and it is obvious that it *may* so be used in Quintil. IX 4, 51 (*pedum et digitorum ictu*).¹ Similarly also Juba (in Priscian, G. L., vol. III, p. 420, 20—not cited by Professor Bennett), in speaking of the scanning of the trimeter by dipodies, says in explanation of the spondees in the odd feet, *quoniam ter feritur hic versus, necesse est, ubicumque ab ictu percussionis vacat, moram temporis adiecti non reformidet*. Here also it would seem that *ictus* is a general term for beat, but that the designation for the accented beat is *percussio* (and so Caes. Bassus, cited above, says: *loca percussionis*, and Quintil. IX 4, 75: *sex pedes, tres percussiones habent*). But still Professor Bennett would urge that *percussio* is used figuratively for beat and does not imply stress in any way. But let us see. We have already pointed out that in a rhythm $\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}$ there will be six syllables characterized by quantitative prominence. But if we are to put into the same scheme three elements of prominence instead of six, it can only be done by varying intensities, thus, $\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, and that is what the language tells us as plainly as possible, viz. that it is struck (*percutere ferire*, cf. also *caedere plaudere*) three times.² Perhaps it may be said, at all events there was no stress

¹ But *ictus* κατ' ἐξοχήν of the down beat is perfectly natural—as when in rapid $\frac{3}{4}$ time the conductor gives but two beats, right and left, ignoring the unaccented times—and thus Horace uses the word A. P. 253.

² In note 1, p. 382, Professor Bennett says that Westphal, "although a pronounced adherent of the stress theory of *ictus*, is not bold enough to seek in

in such cases on the iambs falling between the *percussiones*. That is not a point with which I am concerned at present, but it may be observed that, in accordance with all laws of rhythm and phonology, a primary stress of the form $\cup - \cup \cup$ will hardly exist without a secondary stress of the form $\cup \cup \cup \cup$, and so Horace apparently felt it (*cum senos redderet ictus*). So in regard to the other terms used to designate the prominent part of the foot (*pedem supplodere*, *plausus* or *pulsus pedis*, *streptus digitorum* (snapping the fingers), *pollicis sonor*), in denying to them any significance as indicating vocal stress Professor Bennett overlooks the intimate association of mind and muscular expression. That these terms indicative of muscular contraction, corresponding to the prominent part of the foot, afford indubitable evidence of the presence in the mind of recurrent pulsations of intensity will scarcely be denied. But what the mind feels the muscular organism reproduces. It is therefore a matter of indifference from an abstract point of view what muscles are involved. In beating time to music or to verse the listener interprets the recurrent mental stress by striking finger or foot on floor or table; the performer finds the outlet for the recurrent sensations of intensity in the muscular response of the whole vocal organism. Therefore, if we grant that the ancients beat time in a way that implies mental stress, we can not reasonably hold that such designations have no significance as indicating vocal stress.¹

Up to this point I have endeavored to show that the existence of rhythm of recurrent intensities can be demonstrated for ancient verse by a logical analysis of the doctrines of the ancient theorists, by consideration of the psychological aspects of rhythm and (closely connected with this) by a rational interpretation of the terms used to describe or mark the prominent part of the foot or rhythm.

But let us now turn to Latin verse, and in the absence of statements to the contrary, I suppose we must assume that Professor Bennett means his theory to apply to the verse of Plautus and Terence as well as to Virgil and Horace. But it will not require

this word (*percussio*) any confirmation of his view." Such a statement would seem to imply that Westphal has somewhere discussed the matter, or considered it a debatable question. So far as my knowledge goes he always assumes that rhythmic accent was stress, and this, according to Professor Bennett, has been the unwarranted assumption of all scholars of the past, except only Madvig.

¹Cf. Bolton, l. c., p. 90, who has some very interesting and curious observations on the relation of muscular movements to rhythm. "Most subjects felt themselves impelled by an irresistible force to make muscular movements of some sort accompanying the rhythms. If they attempted to restrain these movements in one muscle, they were very likely to appear somewhere else." Again, p. 91: "Slight or nascent muscular contractions were felt in the root of the tongue or larynx. . . . When (the subject) was asked to restrain all muscular movements, he found great difficulty in maintaining the rhythmical grouping."

elaborate proof to maintain that in the verse of Plautus and Terence there is a rhythmical accent of essentially the same nature as the word-accent. For the two phenomena work just alike and produce the same results, so that it is not always easy to decide whether a given example of syllable-shortening is due to special metrical or general prosodical causes. The matter is so familiar that examples are superfluous.¹

But for another period of the Latin language it may be shown that the rhythmical stress and the word-accent were considered of the same nature. For there is an interesting passage of Gellius (VI 7) in which inference concerning the accent of words is made from the rhythmical prominence which the syllables receive in the verse of the early poets. By this method the poet and antiquarian Annianus, following the lead of the grammarian Probus, determined for the edification of his friend Gellius the correct accent form for a number of adverbs compounded with *ad—affatim*, *exadversum*—and Gellius goes on to give other illustrations reached by the same method. Concerning the soundness of the method there may be doubt, but if the reader will refer to the passage he will not be able to doubt that rhythmical accent is here invoked to determine word-accent.² To deny significance to this evidence would only be possible, I imagine, on the basis of some theory of accent such as Professor Bennett has advanced in the beginning of his paper, for which he does not claim more than that it is possible, and to himself seems even probable. But, obviously, for the age of Plautus and Terence such a theory is not possible, as the phenomena of metrical and prosodical *correptio* already referred to prove to suffocation.³

Professor Bennett says that recent discussion has tended to show that the native Latin verse as exemplified by the Saturnian measure was governed by stress, but that from the time of Ennius "a Latin verse consisted of an orderly and harmonious arrangement of long and short syllables." In theory that is of course true, but in fact the hexameters of Ennius, like the trimeters of Pacuvius and Accius, carry such a burden of spondees that, were it not for the pure foot next to last and an occasional lighter line,

¹ In many cases the shortening is metrical (i. e. due to the influence of the rhythmical stress) and not prosodical (i. e. due to the habit of ordinary word-accent). For the whole question cf. Klotz, *Grundzüge d. altröm. Metrik* (Leipzig, 1890), and note especially p. 88: "Wir haben in allen den zahlreichen Fällen wo wir dieses metrische Kürzungsgesetz beobachtet haben, gefunden, das nicht der geringste Unterschied zwischen naturlangen und positionslangen Silben gemacht wurde, weil eben dies Gesetz in erster Linie ein metrisches, das entscheidende Moment eine bestimmte Position bestimmter Silben im Verse ist, und keine vulgäre Vernachlässigung des gewöhnlichen Positionsgesetzes vorliegt."

² Cf. Schöll, *De Accentu Linguae Latinae*, p. 26 and note 1.

³ From notes 1 and 3, p. 376, I should infer that Professor Bennett would concede this.

we should not know that we were reading verse.¹ I open Müller's Ennius at random and in the frg. 196-203 of the Annals I find four out of eight lines consisting entirely of spondees except in the fifth foot. Now, what could have made out of that cumbersome mass of syllables a literary form that should be tolerable? Rhythm of recurrent stress—and nothing but such rhythm; the same rhythm that skips merrily over the long vowels and clogging consonants of Plautus and moulds them to its will, the rhythm which has the power to lengthen the short syllable and shorten the long, and is the arbitrary genius of all the musical arts.²

The general quantitative correctness of classical poetry does not enable us to see the active moulding power of rhythm and rhythmic stress to anything like the same degree as in the earlier Latin verse, but there are some utterances of writers of this period that would seem to me important for the determination of the question in hand. Cicero and Quintilian, in dealing with the question of oratorical rhythm and cadences, contain not a little that bears on this question, but I must limit myself to a single important passage from Quintilian, though in passing I would refer the reader to the lucid statement of the nature of rhythm in De Or. III 185 ff., where time and stress elements both receive their due attention. In Quintilian, I 10 there is a discussion of music and its elements in its relation to oratory of exceptional interest. In section 22 Aristoxenus' division of musical utterance into *ῥυθμός* and *μέλος* is given, *quorum alterum modulatione, alterum canore et sonis constat*. These have not an exclusive place in song and poetry: *atqui in orando quoque intentio vocis, remissio, flexus, pertinet ad movendos audientium adfectus* (25). These are the rhythmical elements which are comprised in the term *modulatio*—stress (*intentio*) and the absence of stress (*remissio*), with qualitative and quantitative variations implied in the vaguer word *flexus*.

This passage leads me naturally to a consideration of the ancient definitions of *arsis* and *thesis*, which I can not think have been fairly handled by Professor Bennett. That the Latin grammarians and metricians, through ignorance and hasty compilation, have brought miserable confusion into the use of these words is obvious. But let us beware of adding to the confusion. Thus, when Professor Bennett says that Marius Victorinus is probably the only metrician who uses *arsis* in the sense of Greek *θέσις* (p. 367), and that he does it but once, one wonders why no mention is made of the fact that in the same chapter referred to, *sublatio* and *tollere* are repeatedly used of the accented part of

¹Cf. Horace, A. P. 258:

hic (sc. υ—) et in Acci
nobilibus trimetris adparet rarus et Enni
in scaenam missos cum magno pondere versus, etc.

²Cf. Mar. Victor., G. L. VI, p. 42, 3: *nam ut (rhythmus) volet, protrahit tempora, ita ut breve tempus plerumque longum efficiat, longum contrahat.*

the foot. For it is a question of the meaning attached to a term or its equivalents, and not a question of the occurrence of the word *arsis*. Again, one may well wonder on what ground it can be said that Marius Victorinus is probably the only metrician who uses *arsis* thus, when the definition of Martianus Capella agrees so closely with that of Marius Victorinus. But to come to the definitions themselves, the "unique ragout" of Marius Victorinus is more valuable than it seems to Professor Bennett, for it reveals the excellent character of the sources employed by this metrician. First he gives the Greek use of the terms and says (G. L. VI, p. 40, 14): *significant motum pedis, est enim arsis sublatio pedis sine sono, thesis positio pedis cum sono*. That the idea of a muscular intensity corresponding to a mental sensation of stress is contained in the words *positio pedis cum sono*, will seem clear, I think, in the light of what has been said on the relation of muscular movements to rhythm. There follows then the definition of the terms reversed: *item arsis elatio temporis, soni, vocis; thesis depositio et quaedam contractio syllabarum*. This is a definition which reveals thought or an excellent source. For it is a general definition of rhythmical θέσις. It is the prominence given in the foot to a time (χρόνος) as in rhythmical theory, to a sound as in pure musical rhythm, to a syllable (vocis) as in verse. In the definition of *thesis* as *depositio et quaedam contractio syllabarum* we have a valuable piece of correct observation, in the explanation of the fact that in the unaccented part of the foot a long syllable may be shortened (*contractio*) under the influence of the adjacent stress. I have already alluded to examples of this in the verse of Plautus and Terence, and it is of course the theoretical basis of justification for the spondee in iambic or trochaic rhythms.

In entire harmony with this definition is that of Martianus Capella (and others) cited by Professor Bennett on p. 368: *arsis est elevatio, thesis depositio vocis ac remissio* (IX 365, 17). The significance of this definition of *arsis* for vocal stress Professor Bennett seeks to invalidate (1) by implying that it is very doubtful if *elevatio vocis* could possibly have been meant as stress of voice, or if so (2) he thinks that it applies to the accentual poetry of the time. But in regard to the first point it should be noticed that *elevatio vocis* stands in antithesis to *remissio* (where Quintilian with better observation used *intentio vocis*, v. supra, p. 203), and, further, that the identification of or confusion between pitch and intensity is an error that modern phoneticians have only recently learned to avoid.¹ In regard to the second point it need only be observed that the definition of Martianus Capella and the rest is not their own, as the close relationship with Marius Victorinus shows, nor is there any ground for believing that Martianus Capella, whose poetry is quantitative, would have given a

¹ Cf. Sievers, *Phonetik*, p. 177; Techmer, *Phonetik*, p. 69. Cf. also Diomedes, G. L. I, p. 430, 29: *Accentus est . . . elatio orationis vocisve intentio*.

definition of arsis meant to apply to an accentual poetry which he did not practise. The consideration of rhythm may conclude with the description of rhythm from the Anon. de Musica (1 and 85): ὁ ῥυθμὸς συνίστηκεν ἐκ τε ἄρσεως καὶ θέσεως καὶ χρόνου τοῦ καλουμένου παρὰ τισὶ κενού,¹ and enough has been advanced to show what the nature of ἄρσις and θέσις is.

There still remains one point on which I would touch, although I approach it with some apprehension, and that is the scansion of the dactyl and tribrach in iambic rhythms. Professor Bennett attaches much importance to this matter (pp. 380 and 381, in replying to the criticism of Professor Hale), and evidently, if it could be shown that these feet were scanned — ∪ ∪ and ∪ ∪ ∪, it would have no little influence upon his attitude toward the whole matter. But he says "not a shred of evidence exists to support this theory," and he reiterates his emphasis of the absence of such evidence so strongly that I am led to distrust the testimony for it that I seem to have found.² But, nevertheless, I shall venture to present it, and leave its interpretation to the judgment of the benevolent reader. Caesius Bassus, the grammarian, and poet-friend of Persius (ap. Rufin., G. L. VI, p. 555), ad *Neronem de iambico sic dicit*: *'Iambicus autem, cum pedes etiam dactylici generis adsumat, desinit iambicus videri, nisi percussione ita moderaveris, ut cum pedem supplodis, quam iambicum³ ferias; . . . quod dico exemplo faciam illustrius. est in Eunuchio Terentii statim in prima pagina hic versus trimetrus:*

Exclusit, revocat: redeam? non, si me obsecret.

*hunc incipe ferire, videberis heroum habere inter manus.'*⁴

That the subject was one of considerable discussion is shown also by Marius Victorinus (p. 49, 22), treating of the middle place in five-syllable feet (e. g. — ∪ ∪ ∪ —), which become iambic or trochaic

¹ Cf. Mar. Victor., G. L. VI, p. 41, 24: (rhythmi) origo de arsi et thesi manare dinoscitur.

² Christ, *Metrik*, p. 52, to whom Professor Bennett refers, says with more reserve: "Zwar kenne ich kein Zeugnis aus dem Alterthum, welches uns lehrt," etc.

³ *quam iambicum*]. So all the MSS ap. Keil. Keil reads, however, *iambum ferias*. The meaning is not altered essentially, but the reading of the MSS is much clearer, with easy ellipsis of *dactylum*, i. e. "unless . . . you 'strike' the dactyl as an iambus."

⁴ Clear evidence that the dactyl was thus scanned in the verse of Plautus and Terence may be derived from the plays themselves. In such an example as that in the text there is no harshness, for the rhythmic accent agrees with the word-accent (*revocat*). But in Greek trimeters of the new comedy dactylic words are found frequently in the odd places, especially the first (e. g. *εἰκοσι*). Neither has Plautus any hesitation in using dactylic words in the same position (e. g. *omnidus, confice, piscibus*). But in Terence cases of this kind are extremely rare, so that we must infer that Terence felt the harshness of pronunciation arising from the conflict of verse and word-accent, and therefore avoided the situation (cf. Klotz, *Grundzüge altröm. Metrik*, pp. 273-278).

according as the middle syllable is attached to the preceding or the following. The example given is: *Armiger in Ida pede vago litora petens*. Victorinus does not, to be sure, in this connection say anything expressly in regard to the position of the *percussio metrica*, but he does affirm that as a result of this possible variation *multiplex harum figurarum numerus* [ρῶθμός] *per differentias oritur*. As we have seen from the abstract point of view, and as is pointed out by Caesius Bassus, this difference of rhythmical effect must be produced by the distribution of the rhythmical accent. This again is told us expressly by Servius in Donatum (G. L. IV, p. 425, 8 ff.). He treats of the same question for three- and five-syllable feet, but his illustration is drawn from the former. In such case, he says, the question whether the middle syllable belongs to arsis or thesis (using these words, in accordance with a common practice, arbitrarily of the first (*principium*) and last (*finis*) part of the foot, regardless of emphasis) must be considered: *et hoc ex accentu colligimus. nam si in prima syllaba fuerit accentus* [∪∪∪], *arsis duas syllabas possidebit* [∪∪|∪]; *si autem in media syllaba* [∪∪∪], *thesi duas syllabas damus* [∪|∪∪]. The difficulty would not arise, of course, in connection with all trisyllabic feet, but as the ambiguity comes from the succession of short syllables, it is natural that he should have in mind the primary trisyllabic foot, ∪∪∪. I need scarcely point out that *accentus* here refers to the rhythmical accent and not to word-accent. For not once in the chapter does Servius confuse word and foot, an interpretation of his meaning which brought such devastation into his doctrine when, later, Julianus and Pompeius added trisyllabic words as illustrations.¹

The application of the principle of no rhythmic stress to the reading of Latin verse leads Professor Bennett to the enunciation of some views which I dissent from not less heartily than from his primary thesis. Such is, for instance, the statement with which he sums up his discussion (p. 379), that "Latin poetry is to be read exactly like Latin prose." I am aware that I impose upon these words an interpretation which their author did not perhaps mean them to bear, when I affirm my belief that the consistent application of his theory could lead to no other result than that which is thus frankly stated.² For if we consider only the succession of long

¹ The three are grouped together by Professor Bennett (on pp. 368 and 370) in the order Julianus, Servius, Pompeius, without recognition of the distinction pointed out in the text. It is no wonder, therefore, that he despairs of unravelling the tangle. Julianus and Pompeius are "concerned with the phenomena of individual words," but not so Servius. The matter is of no importance, but if we wish to solve puzzles of this kind we can not neglect chronology.

² Without the moulding power of rhythmic movement a purely quantitative rhythm can not be sustained in language. For in ordinary pronunciation all long syllables are not of the same duration, nor again all short syllables, as Aristoxenus had very accurately observed, and as modern phonetic studies have demonstrated.

and short syllables, with nothing to bind the smaller quantitative group of the foot into a higher unity of the rhythm, then all sense of movement and coherency must be lost. Just as in the psychological experiments to which I have referred the subjects report that they could avoid the rhythmic grouping of the whole by close attention to each impression.¹ Or to put my feeling about the matter in another way, I should believe that such a theory could only lead us to look upon the metrical schemes of the poet from the same lifeless, mechanical point of view as is revealed in one of the ancient conceptions of metrical feet which Professor Bennett quotes with approval. It is from the *Commentum Einsidlense*, and as quoted by him reads thus: *his [sc. pedibus] . . . ad peragendos versus tempora syllabasque metimur*. Supply the omitted words, *quasi pedali regula*, "as with a foot-rule," and we see the ground on which we are standing. That Professor Bennett does not shrink from a reversion to such a mechanical conception is shown by his pamphlet on the 'Quantitative Reading of Latin Poetry,' which I have just received through the courtesy of the publishers. There he affirms (with a dogmatism which the requirements of a school manual may excuse) that the ancients [Romans] felt the lesser Asclepiadean (as in *Maecenas atavis*) thus: — — | — ∪ ∪ — | — ∪ ∪ — | ∪ —. Irrational spondee, choriambi, pyrrhichius—as though there could be any talk of *feeling*² in such a hodge-podge of heterogeneous feet, which makes of the poet's art a mere piece of mosaic jugglery, instead of an organic growth and development from certain simple rhythmical forms.³

But it is impossible to consider all of the questions which crowd upon one *à propos* of the new doctrines of Professor Bennett, and I must content myself with the hope that other conclusions concerning rhythm and ancient metres, derived from the fundamental denial of rhythmic accent, fall together with that arbitrary assumption.

May 22, 1899.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

Die Sintfluthsagen untersucht von HERMANN USENER. Bonn, Friedrich Cohen, 1899.

In Professor Usener's 'Sintfluthsagen' we have another installment of his great work on Greek Mythology, another specimen

¹ See Bolton, l. c., p. 63. Ritschl had this complaint to make of Madvig ("das so sehr über den Fuss gespannte Verhältniss Madvig's zur Metrik," etc., op. III, p. 160), whom Professor Bennett recognizes as his predecessor in his primary position.

² All rhythmical feeling depends upon the recurrence of impressions quantitatively equal or approximately so. It is a matter of indifference whether this equivalence is made up of separate sound impressions or rests and holds, and this is as true of modern poetry as of ancient.

³ The matter is developed by Usener in his fascinating book, *Altgriechischer Versbau*, Bonn, 1887.

of his vast erudition and his wonderful power of combination. To summarize is all that lies within the competence of the present reviewer, and a summary of such a work is necessarily imperfect, not necessarily unwelcome.

The literature of the deluge is itself a deluge, for the story of the flood is found everywhere in legendary lore. It is not confined to the East. Noah has his counterpart in Melanesia. Deukalion and Pyrrha have their doubles on the banks of the Orinoco. But this only shows how easily, how naturally such myths may arise under the most varied circumstances, and Professor Usener repudiates the notion that great Neptunian convulsions of nature could be propagated in these legends. The memory of the human race stops short of primeval cataclysms; and the only myths that interest the mythologist are those whose origin and history hold out a prospect of successful research. These are the Semitic and Aryan myths, and of the Aryan only the Hindu and the Greek.

The first chapter deals with the Chaldean account of the deluge, with the eleventh tablet of the Izdubar epic and the Berossos version of the flood. The Biblical story as told by Jahvist and Elohist follows, the Elohist faring as the Elohist usually fares. Next Jacobi's version of the strange Hindu story of Manu and the fish swims into our ken, and upon the analysis of these legends follows the Greek myth.

There is no deluge in Homer, none in Hesiod's Works and Days, in which we might have expected a cataclysm to sweep away the violent age of brass. The first Greek mention of it occurs in the *κατάλογος γυναικῶν*, from which the logographers drew the famous story of Deukalion and Pyrrha. But the details given in the fragments of the logographers vary, and our first witness is Pindar, our most popular witnesses, Horace and Ovid. No poet, however, arose to give definite form and body to the story, and the mountain on which Deukalion and Pyrrha landed is called now Parnassus, now Athos, now Aetna. The cause of the deluge prevalently given is the naughtiness of the human race; but there are deviations as to the special guilt. On the origin of the new breed from the stones thrown over the shoulders of the rescued pair there is general agreement, and whether Zeus or Apollo gave the counsel, the pun is saved alive, and the *λῆοι*, for the form *λῆος* has been proved, became *λαοί*. But Deukalion was not the only proprietor of a flood. There was Ogygos, who gave his name to an Attic and a Boeotian deluge. There was Dardanos, who was floated out of Arcadia and landed in Samothrace. And there were Hellenistic accounts in which Greek myths and Semitic were blended. Especially noteworthy is Kelainai in Phrygia, afterwards Apameia with the surname *Κιβωτός*, the coins of which show Noah and his wife tranquilly seated in what looks like an opera-box and the same couple promenading on shore. There is nothing strange in this, for Asia Minor was overflowed by Hellenized Jews in the time of Augustus.

The next chapter, which treats at length of Deukalion, takes up an etymology already suggested in the 'Götternamen' and discusses the proper names in -κλῆς and -κλος. -κλος is older than -κλῆς. It is a diminutive termination, which was afterward fashioned over into the significant -κλῆς from κλέος. Ἡρακλῆς is called by Sophron, and that not merely in fun, Ἡρούκαλος. He is not the 'Glory of Hera,' but 'the Little Hero,' who fought with serpents in his cradle. Ἡ. is merely a pet name for the hero whose career has been so tersely summed up by Wilamowitz: "Mensch gewesen, gott geworden; mühen erduldet, himmel erworben." In like manner Δευκαλίων is a diminutive of Δεύκαλος, which Δεύκαλος is a pet name for Ζεύς, and appears elsewhere as Διοκλος, Διοκλέας, Διοκλῆς. The famous Διὸς Κόρινθος was originally Διοσκόρινθος, i. e. Δίος Κόρινθος 'the boy Zeus.' Korinthos was not the son of Zeus, but Zeus himself, and so Deukalion was not the grandson of Zeus, but Zeus himself. The Cretan birth of Zeus is satisfied by the story that Deukalion was the son of Minos and Pyrrha is provided for as the mate of Πύρρος, another name for Zeus, and the πυρρίχη or weapon-dance comes from Πύρριχος, a diminutive of Πύρρος.

The name of Pyrrhus is ablaze with light. The landing of Deukalion is the landing of a god of light, and the peak of Parnassus where Deukalion landed was called Λυκώρεια, now Λυκέρι, the 'light look-out.' But what is the connection between light and flood? The Biblical account spans the chasm with a rainbow. But we go further afield, or, if one may say so, further afloat, and follow the figure of 'The Godkin in the Ark,' 'Das götterknäblein in der truhe,' which is the title of the next section. The best known of these is Perseus, his chest of cunning workmanship, his λάρναξ δαιδαλία having been immortalized by Simonides. That Perseus was originally a sun-god needs no demonstration, and as such divine honors were paid to him. Telephos, the son of Auge, a goddess of light, is another floater, and the landing of his mother is represented on a coin of Elaia, the port of Pergamos. Oidipus too, according to one version of his story, was imprisoned in an ark which was driven ashore at Sikyon, but the name of Oidipus has not thus far yielded any light. More remunerative are the old legends of Tenedos, the landing-place of Tennes and Hemithea, who had been shut up in a chest by their father Kyknos. Tennes, really a son of Apollo, was afterward slain by Achilles, and Apollo avenged the death of his son. Yet another ray of light falls from the ancient name of Tenedos, Δεύκοφρις, 'the eyebrow of the dawn.' The hero of Delos, the birthplace of Apollo, was one Anios, who was called by his mother Rhoio, a son of sorrow (ἀνία), as Benjamin was called by Rachel Benoni. This Rhoio, bearing the pure seed of the god, was shut up in a chest by her angry father, Staphylos, and carried by the waves to Delos. Staphylos ('Cluster') and Rhoio ('Pomegranate') clearly belong to the Dionysiac cycle. But is not Dionysos one of the gods of light? Semele, the mother of

Dionysos, was also cabined in a chest and the waves bore her to Prasia, on the western coast of Laconia. The image of Dionysos and the *cista mystica* are figured on the coins of Patrai, together with the hero Eurypylos, who introduced the worship of Dionysos into Patrai, and who is doubtless one with the god whom he introduced; for, like Dionysos, Eurypylos opens the gates wide—the gates of life, the gates of death:

ἔγγυς γὰρ νυκτός τε καὶ ἡματός εἰσι κέλευθοι.

This chest with its living prisoner floats down the tide of the ages. The ark becomes a prosaic barrel. Oidipus is christened Gregory. Telephos becomes Sigurd, and the stork that brings the German babies fishes them out of the same mythic waters that bore Perseus to Seriphos.

From the chest, the ark, we turn to the ship. Dionysos in the ark is a rarer figure than Dionysos on the ship, its mast wreathed with grape-vines. This form of the Dionysiac epiphany was originally Ionic, but spread beyond Ionic bounds. In fact, scholars recognize the ship of Dionysos in the *carrus navalis*, one of the regular features of the old Shrovetide procession and, according to some etymologists, the source of the word 'carnival.' Nor was the custom of parading the image or symbol of a god confined to the cult of Dionysos. It is found in the worship of Athena at Athens. It existed down to the twelfth century in the Netherlands, and a ship built in the same mythic shipyard brought St. Ursula and her eleven thousand virgins to Cologne.

To one who has followed Professor Usener's studies among the Bollandists, it is not surprising that he makes the Christian festival of the Epiphany a transfer of the Dionysiac epiphany, and he quotes a passage from an archbishop of Constantinople (437-447) in which Christ himself is presented under the figure of a ship. The ship is a Christian symbol. Early Christian lamps have the shape of a ship. The ship was borne on Christian seals. It is figured on monuments in the catacombs. It reappears in German hymns and English Christmas-carols. This ship is the *εὐνή κοίλη* of the sun one remembers from Mimnermos, it is the great Pendragonship one remembers from Tennyson. There is a whole fleet of these ships in Christian legend.

It is a rapid transit from ship to fish, as Jonah could testify, or in Greek waters from ship to dolphin, as Arion might tell; for the dolphin is the special Greek form, and Professor Usener traces the dolphin now on coins that make a belt stretching from Pontus to Paestum, now in the wide domain of heathen and Christian legend. The dolphin is by excellence the *ἱερός ἰχθύς*. It was sacred to Poseidon. It was sacred to Apollo. Nay, Apollo himself appears under the form of a dolphin in the hieratic hymn which honors the Pythian Apollo. According to the theory advocated in the 'Götternamen,' the original deity was *Δελφίνιος*, an independent god, but afterwards annexed as an

attribute (A. J. P. XVII 360). The story of Arion on the dolphin has made the figure of the dolphin-rider popular, but the mythologist notes that the legend has to do with those places only in which there were well-known images of the pair, with Tarentum, Taenarum, Corinth. Now, all these images were consecrated to Melikertes. But, though Melikertes is the Greek form of the Phoenician Melkarth, 'King of the City,' Professor Usener does not share Keller's belief that the whole thing is of Phoenician origin. The true Greek name is Palaimon, and the Phoenician name and the Phoenician traits have been taken up into a truly Greek cycle. There is no lack of historical anecdotes in connection with the dolphin. A dolphin brings the corpse of the murdered Hesiod to shore. A dolphin falls in love with a boy of Iasos and is buried in the same grave with his beloved. Closely examined, these stories and all the rest go back to the original cult, and the same thing may be said of the fish which appears in Christian martyrology, far apart as St. Lukianos and Dionysos may seem to be.

But what is the meaning of ark and ship and fish? What is the mythic *motif* behind all these manifestations?

Now, the prime conditions of a mythic *motif*, as laid down by Professor Usener, are that it be manifold, that it be multisignificant. There is, for instance, a primal belief that every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, that there is a treasure laid up in heaven, or haply hidden by the gods in hell, an inexhaustible source of blessing and wealth. The forms of that treasure vary. It is now a herd of kine, now a hoard of gold and silver. Now it appears as the golden fleece of Phrixus, now as the Apollo-fountain Kyrene, both sung in the Fourth Pythian of Pindar. Now it is a horn of plenty, now Fortunatus' purse. These are all various phases of the same idea. In like manner ark, ship, fish are phases of the same idea, and the idea is the coming of the dawn. Ark, ship, fish are vehicles; but not they alone. The vehicle may be a hero. So Hermes and Herakles carry the boy god in their arms. So St. Christopher carries through the flood the Light of the World on his back.

The other quality of the mythic figure, the one which, according to Professor Usener, is the fertile and fatal source of error, is its multisignificance, is the variety of interpretation of which it is susceptible, is its 'Vieldeutigkeit.' 'Wasp' suggests a waist, suggests a temper. Footsteps are 'dogged' and tempers are 'dogged.' 'Spider-webs' give one side, 'spider-legs' another. There is one 'flower' of speech and another 'flower' of sulphur, and so on without end. Thus, the figures of the myth have a manifold play. In the Rigveda the kine of the heavens, which form the heavenly treasure, let down the rain as they give forth the light. The kine of the sun-god in Od. XII are the days of the year. We are not to attempt, as Kuhn has done, to derive all mythical figures from actual processes. We must allow the

primitive fancy to play its game in its own sweet way, and to turn a battle between light and darkness, between day and night, between summer and winter, into a battle between life and death. The primal notion of the abode of the gods as a mountain or other special region is another figure that leads to a series of developments: the Olympus of Homer, the Garden of Eden, the Land of the Hyperboreans, the Land of the blameless Aethiopians, the Islands of the Blessed, the Elysian Fields. There were no ravening beasts in Crete, the birthplace of Zeus. There are no snakes in Ireland, the Island of the Saints. No rain or snow fell on the image of Artemis at Iasos in Caria. No rain or snow fell on the compound at Ephesus, where St. John wrote his Gospel.

Another phase. This life has always been more or less a vale of tears, and men have always looked backward or forward to a Golden Age. The good old times are matched by a good time coming. Hesiod tells of the past. The Greek comic poets abound in pictures of the future, so that one becomes somewhat weary of the Land of Cocagne; and Vergil and Horace both describe the blessedness that is to be. The Messianic time is a familiar phrase, and Pope recalls Pollio.

In like manner the simple figure of the dawn is the *motif* of all these varied images of ark and ship and fish. The god is borne by the flood to the summit of a mountain, to a cliff, to an island, and thence rises to heaven, to the gods. This is his epiphany, not his birth; but epiphany and birth fall together. Ship and fish, Argo and dolphin are one. The magic ship of the Phaeacians, the bark of Charon alike take us to the world beyond. Heathen and Christian graves share the symbol, and the fish represents Christ as the dolphin represents Apollo. The interpretation of the Greek word ΙΧΘΥΣ as Ἰ(ησοῦς) Χ(ριστὸς) Θ(εοῦ) Υ(ἰός) Σ(ωτήρ) is an afterthought.

The path that leads to the results of Professor Usener's investigation winds through so many fascinating phenomena that there is scant space left for the results themselves, for tracing the outgrowth of the Greek account of the deluge from the details of the figures which represent the revelation of the god of light, for showing the independence of the Hindu account and the evolution of the Semitic legend. For all this the reader must be referred to the book itself. No notice, however detailed, would suffice to give a just conception of the wealth of learning and the range of vision which it displays.

B. L. G.

REPORTS.

HERMES, XXXIII (1898).

J. Kromayer, *Zur Geschichte des II. Triumvirats*, reviews the Illyrian campaigns of 35-34 B. C., and the events that led up to Actium. The beginning of the quarrel was Octavian's refusal to share Italy as a recruiting basis, which made Antony's army mainly Oriental. Their correspondence, begun by Octavian because of the Alexandrian presentations, is confined to the year 33.

G. Busolt, *Aristoteles oder Xenophon*. Aristotle in his account of the Thirty drew from the *Atthis* of Androtion, which treated the period very fully, and is shown to be more reliable than Xenophon. The latter did not write till ten years after the events, and his rhetorical treatment often distorts the facts.

R. Reitzenstein und E. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Sallust gegen Cicero*. Whereas the invective against Sallust is fictitious and late, that against Cicero is an extract from a pamphlet published in 54, as appears from its praise of Crassus, its reference to Cicero as a tool of the triumvirs and its knowledge of his private affairs. It seems probable from the author's plebeian station and relation to the triumvirs that the speech is part of the reply of Piso to the *Pisoniana*.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die lebenslänglichen Archonten Athens*. The earliest of these names are fictitious, though with a basis of fact, and the archons' oath by Acastus shows that the Medontidae were not kings. They were a noble family who robbed the monarchy of all real power.

C. Robert, *Theseus und Meleagros bei Bakchylides*. Ode XVII confirms the Bologna vase, which reproduces the picture of Mikon. The scene is beneath the sea and Aphrodite the main character, so that both Nereids and Poseidon are in their proper place. Both vase and poem are based on Simonides, who changed the original Ariadne to Amphitrite, but neither shows us the ring, which was a later addition to the story. The François vase alludes only to the dance of deliverance at Delos. Ode V reconciles the two versions of Meleager's death, and its plot is identical with Phrynichus' *Pleuroniae*, which was like the *Septem*. Euripides made many changes in the myth.

H. Wirz gives a detailed description of twelve Palatine MSS of Sallust.—Th. Mommsen discusses the MSS of Eupippius. The agreement of RS with I insures the correct reading.—P. von Win-

terfeld offers sundry conjectures, inter al. Ter. And. 434 *Nequeo* for *Aeque*.—P. Wendland. Jesus was mocked by the Roman soldiers because he was like the Saturnalia king, whom it was the custom to sacrifice at the close of the festival. Hence John 19. 7-12 is impossible.—F. Blass. In Aesch. Cho. 32 φόβος (*φοῖβος*) is a gloss. The consequent change in metre upholds l. 25 *πρέπει* κτλ.—E. Schwartz comments on the life of Augustus by Nikolaos of Damascus.

E. Schwartz, Die Vertheilung der römischen Provinzen nach Caesars Tod. The accounts of this period are sadly confused and often incorrect. Dio and Livy, who drew from Augustus' memoirs, are very unfair to Antony, representing him as a coward and robbing him of the credit of the amnesty. Plutarch is fair to both Antony and Octavian, and seems to follow a tradition that goes back to Brutus' letters. Appian's source is a sensational romance of the time of Claudius, which upholds Antony against both Octavian and Cicero. All writers give many details regarding Octavian, who was, however, not very important at the first, and all agree that Brutus and Cassius were low, selfish oligarchs.

J. Vahlen, *Varia*, defends *una* with *communicem* in ad Att. I 18, 1, and *μετά* in Theoc. XVI 61, interprets XV 37; in Apul. Apol., p. 74 Kr. reads *τόπον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ νότον*, and p. 7, 6 defends *Zenonem*. By supplying a lacuna in Suetonius' life of Horace, we see that he died Nov. 27, just 59 days after Maecenas.

G. Wentzel, *Hesychiana*. Dionysius' *Μουσικὴ ἱστορία* is a source neither of Hesychius nor of Rufus, and neither Stephanus nor Hesychius draw from Philo, whose work was geographical, while they are mainly biographical. Stephanus' source was Hesychius, for it was younger than Philo, gives the teachers and friends of its subjects, arranges authors according to literary categories and philosophers according to sects, and was also used by Diogenes Laertius.

E. Bethe, *Das griechische Theater* Vitruvs. Dörpfeld now holds that Vitruvius is describing the buildings of Asia Minor and that, though their stages were really used for acting, those in Greece were too narrow for this purpose. But the width depends on the size of the theatre and the frequency of scenic performances. Two Greek theatres have one row of honor seats at the orchestra for viewing choral dances and one at the diazoma for seeing action on the stage. Moreover, the height of the stage in Greece is nearer the Vitruvian model than in Asia, and the decoration is the same; in fact, the two types are identical. Again, at Eretria the dressing-rooms are level not with the orchestra, but with the top of the proscenium, and the Naples terracotta shows clearly a stage with traces of people on it.

P. Meyer discusses recent additions to the list of *praefecti Aegypti*. Claudius Firmus set up Psilaan, prince of the Blemmyi,

as emperor, and ruled Egypt as his prefect.—W. Dittenberger. The hieromnemon from Sosthenis in Oetaea was not an Aetolian.—H. Pomtow. The Chian Amphiktyon probably represented Euboea, just as Spartans stood for Doris. Members of the Aetolian League sometimes bore the name of their country, not of their city.—H. Diels. The Metapontine river that greeted Pythagoras was named Casa (v. Bac. XI 119).—G. Busolt. Thucydides was recalled by special decree, because he was not really an exile and his influence with Sparta was needed by Athens.—J. Ziehen. Vitruvius in I 4. 9 is rationalizing the myths of the founding of cities, where some beast plays an important rôle in the choice of a site. In ad Att. II 17. 2 read *prae hoc Isis* for *phocis*.

M. Wellmann, Die Pflanzennamen des Dioskurides. The genuineness of the synonyms in the first class of MSS is established by comparison with Pliny. The fuller alphabetical lists in the other MSS were made in the third century A. D., and consist of three distinct parts—the illustrations of Krateuas, the lists drawn largely from Pamphilos, and the text of Dioskurides. A list of 541 plants is appended.

R. Heinze, Zu Horaz Briefen. Full commentary on Book I, inter al.: 1. 4-6 refer not to the poet's age, but his desire for independence; 32 *est = licet*; 2. 10 keep *quid*, for *cogo ut* is better than the infinitive; 27-31 does not refer to Aristippus' comparison, but merely to idle luxury. *sponsi* is used, since they act as if they had already won Penelope; 68 *melioribus* means 'better men' (cf. Theog. 31), from whom the *verba* come; 4. 1 *candidus* is 'upright'; 16 is said jokingly, for Augustus disapproved of Epicurean teachings; 5. 2 *olus* means 'modest meal'; 7. 24 *merentis = eius qui laudem meret*, and refers to Maecenas (cf. Sen. IV 36); 8 is written in very artistic prose style to suit the mood of the author; 9. 6 *valdius movit* is unique in Horace, and is due to the climax of feeling; 10 is Epicurean throughout; 26-7 is independent of what precedes; 42 ff. does not refer to Aristippus; 12. 25 *tamen* is a particle of transition, in 14. 26 of continuation; 15. 12 *habena* is abl. of cause, *sed* introduces the reflections of the rider himself; 16. 56 *isto pacto* is not resumptive, but restricts *mihî lenius*; 17. 39 *quod quaerimus* refers to v. 15; 18. 98 keep *num* with *semper inops*; 19. 27, the objection to iambs is their polemic character.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Unechte Briefe. Isoc. Ep. 4 is condemned by its use of *arra*, which careful writers avoided. Isocrates would take no liberties with Antipater. 3 is written after Chaeronea, but Isocrates died a few days after the battle. Plat. Ep. 13 is proved spurious by its reference to Plato's burial of his mother, for she had married again and had another family. Moreover, the letter is not used by his biographers. In Dem.

Ep. 2 it is strange that he should ask for recall from exile without alluding to the cause of banishment, though natural if written by some later admirer.

L. Traube in Plin. N. H. XXXIV 71 defends *se impari*, 84 <amplex> *ando anserem*, XXXV 7 reads *continuae domus*.—H. Stein in Thuc. I 2. 5 reads ἐκ <παλαιστά> του ἐπὶ πλείστον (cf. I 18); 3. 3 <τὸ> ἀντίπαλον and <τὸ πρῶτον> ὡς ἕκαστοι; 6. 5 μετὰ τοῦ γυμνάζεσθαι, πυγμῆς—τίθεται, 7 τείχεσιν, 13. I τὰ πολλὰ—καθίσταντο (read ἤδη τι μᾶλλον), πρότερον—βασίλειαι, and ἡ Ἑλλάς are glosses.—M. Lehnerdt shows that Enoche di Ascoli brought the Germania to Italy in Nov. 1455, and that Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini read it by Jan. 1458.—P. von Winterfeld comments on a citation from Petronius in a scholion to Eugenius Volgarius.—K. P. Schulze. Codex R of Catullus agrees so closely with M as to have no independent value.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Lesefrüchte. In Stat. Theb. III 460 Aphasanta (ἀφήμη) is taken from Antimachus; Ap. Rhod. III 1244 read δαῖθ' for δῆθ'; Arch. ap. Ath. X 447 B ἐμυζε (cf. Xen. An. IV 5. 27); Eur. And. 557 οἷς for ὄς, Iph. A. 573 ἔμαθες, 580 ἔμολε; Ar. Thes. 536 τείσεσθε γ' for τις ἔστιν; in Pl. Menex. 238B the gods are not named, because it was not proper in a funeral oration (Dem. 60. 30), so ἴσμεν γάρ is a gloss; Theoph. Char. 23 read κατὰ χιλίας, the author having written X, which the copyist understood as 600; Aristotle's will shows that he was a Macedonian citizen and Antipater was viceroy, who, as ruler, would be named at the beginning of all wills.

A. Schulten, Römische Flurkarten. The plans in Hyginus, De Lim. are accurate, but are copies from official documents added by a later hand. They include Minturnae, Hispellum in Umbria, Anxur, Aventicum in Switzerland, Aosta and Turin, besides some cities not yet identified, and are probably drawn from Agrippa's statistical work.

C. Robert, Zu Aristophanes Vögel. The four musicians representing foreign birds sit on the hillock, in which Tereus lives, and overlook the chorus; 391 read χύτραν. μακρὰν ὀρῶντας; 405 <γαῖα> ἐπὶ τίνα; 771 βοῆ νόμον; 1150 κατόπιν ὄργασόν θ' ἄμα; in 435 Tereus refers to his own armor; between 865 and 890 an Athena, Demeter, Aphrodite, Hera and Zeus Πολιεὺς or Σωτήρ must have been mentioned, and after 592 a verse is lost, which referred to birds of prophecy; arrange 1203-4 Π. ὄνομα δέ σοι τί; Πάραλος ἢ Σαλαμινία; | I. Ἴρις ταχεῖα; Π. πότερα πλοῖον ἢ κύων; in the first question referring to the Alcibiades affair; put 1343 after 1346 (ἐρῶ = tell) and supply three verses describing the haunts of birds; 1706 ff. belong to Pisthetairos, 1725-30, 1743-47 to the herald, and in 1724 δ should have a line to itself.

A. Rzach. The best MS of Hesiod's Shield is the Cod. Ambros., which with some Paris MSS (2773, suppl. gr. 663) constitutes the most important family. Next in value is the group Par. 2772, Laur. XXXI 32, Harl. 5724.—A. Höck. Kersebleptes, whose four sons are honored in the decree of BCH XX 466 ff. from the summer of 351, could not have been very young in 359, as Dem. 23. 163 states. The Greek names of his sons show that he had a Greek wife. The fourth may be the Teres mentioned in Philip's letter found in Demosthenes' works.—L. D. Barnett. A cup in the Louvre (Pottier, I, pl. 17) shows Pandareos stealing the golden dog, Iris and Hermes, and a Munich amphora (No. 85) presents the marriage of Laertes.—E. Meyer. Only Thyatira and a few other cities were Macedonian colonies, the rest of Schulten's list (Herm. XXXII 523 ff.) were only settlements dependent on some city. Arrian's chief purpose was to write a history of Alexander, but his work on Bithynia is more personal, so that the author is more in evidence. Sulla did not reform the centuries in 88, but put them in place of the tribes.—F. Blass restores papyrus fragments of Menander's Kolax and Georgos.—H. Willrich. The legate A. Ter. Varro mentioned in several inscriptions may have led the detachment of vessels to which Plutarch, Lucull. 3, alludes.—G. Busolt. The phrases *τοῦ δ' ἐπιόρωτος ἔρους* and the like in Xen. Hellen. I and II are proved genuine by the evidence that the interpolator of I 3. 1 found the phrase already in the text.—F. Pichlmayr. The true name of the officer that suppressed the German revolt against Domitian was L. Norbanus Lappius Maximus.—Th. Mommsen. The Tillius of Hor. Sat. I 6. 24 was a *tribunus militum laticlavus*.

BARKER NEWHALL.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, Vol. XXII.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 213-32. On the orthography of the Carthaginian inscriptions, by Aug. Audollent. The object of this article is to show that certain errors in the Latin inscriptions of Africa are due not to simple blunders, but to dialectic peculiarities of the region. The article presents the results of a careful examination of many inscriptions, with classified lists of errors.

2. Pp. 233-45. The Protrepticus of Galen and Jamot's edition (1583), by Mondry Beaudouin. This interesting article, which contains occasional comments on the edition of Kaibel, investigates the sources of Jamot's emendations, showing that the emendations were neither original nor taken from a MS, but were retroversions from the Latin translation of Erasmus, which is appended to Jamot's edition. It is further shown that Bellisarius, in making his translation, used a MS which has, like all the other MSS of the Protrepticus, been lost or at least has disappeared.

3. Pp. 246-56. Critical notes on eleven passages of Cic. Fin. I, by Louis Havet.

4. Pp. 257-73. The oracle of Apollo at Claros, by B. Hausoullier. In this interesting article several inscriptions, hitherto unused in the investigation of this subject, are examined, and much light is thrown upon the question of the usages of the oracle, the officials connected with it, the life of which Claros was the centre, etc.

5. Pp. 274-85. Questions of Latin syntax, by J. Lebreton. I. The use of tenses in the comparative conditionals. Here are enumerated all the examples the author could find in Cicero. He concludes that 1) after *quasi* and *tamquam*, the temporal sequence was observed almost universally: principal after principal tenses, historical after historical; 2) after combinations including independent *si* (*quam si, ut si, etc.*), the ordinary construction of the unreal condition was employed. II. The reflexive in apposition and the attributive complement. Here he adds a rule to existing rules: In apposition or in the complement of an adjective attribute, the reflexive is employed to refer to the logical subject of the abridged sentence. An example of each will make clear the meaning: ad Fam. 13. 25 Eum tibi commendo ut . . . principem civitatis *suae*. Pro Cluent. 39. 109 aliquis defendisset equitem Romanum in municipio *suo nobilem*. All the examples he cites contain only the *possessive suus*.

6. Pp. 286-96. Notes on the Hippolytus of Euripides, by E. Chambry. The MS reading is defended in many passages that have been "emended." The article merits serious attention.

7. Pp. 297-303. On *dierectus*, by Georges Ramain. After an examination of all the examples, the author rejects the definition of Nonius (p. 49, Merc.), and maintains that as adj. or adv. (*dierecte*) it means *at once, (tout droit, tout de suite, etc.)*. He derives it by dissimilation from *de-erectus*, which may have been pronounced at first "deierectus" to prevent its becoming simply *derectus*.

8. Pp. 304-5. J. Keelhoff replies to Prof. Earle on Hdt. I 86, explaining his position more clearly, and vigorously maintaining it.

9. Pp. 305-6. Paul Perdrizet shows that the name *Λιπρόδαρος* in Diodor. XVIII 7, 5, which had been variously "emended" as occurring nowhere else, really occurs on two sling-balls, probably of the end of the fourth century B. C. The π has its second leg shortened, and the \circ and ω are small.

10. Pp. 307 ff. Book Notices. 1) The Wasps of Aristophanes, by W. J. M. Starkie, London, 1897. Albert Martin thinks this work more suitable for scholars than pupils. He criticizes unfavorably some details, but on the whole finds the edition a good one.

2) Aristophanis Ranae cum prolegomenis et commentariis edidit J. van Leeuwen, Leyden, 1896. M. Block objects to some details, and especially condemns the numerous atheteses, but finds the work otherwise good. 3) Platonis opera omnia recensuit et commentariis instruxit Godofredus Stallbaum. Vol. VIII, Sect. II. Editio altera emendatior. Platonis *Sophista*. Recensuit . . . Otto Apelt, Leipzig, 1897. Noticed by Albert Martin. This revised edition is only to a limited extent critical, the notes being chiefly explanatory. The reviewer commends it only moderately. 4) M^{éd}eric Dufour, La Constitution d'Athènes et l'œuvre d'Aristote, Paris, 1895. Noticed by Albert Martin, who considers it a good doctor-dissertation. He makes some comments of his own on the question of authenticity, discussed in the dissertation. 5) Aristotelis Parva Naturalia recensuit Guilelmus Biehl, Leipzig, 1898. A brief description of the work by A. M. without comment. 6) Philodemi volumina rhetorica edidit Siegfried Sudhaus, volumen II, Leipzig, 1896. Briefly described and praised by Albert Martin. 7) Mythographi Graeci, vol. III, fasc. I. Pseudo-Eratosthenis Catasterismi recensuit Alexander Olivieri, Leipzig, 1897. Described and favorably criticized by A. M. The author has shown in a previous publication that this work is not by Eratosthenes. 8) Evangelium secundum Lucam sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber prior, secundum formam quae videtur Romanam edidit F. Blass, Teubner, 1897. Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter, secundum formam quae videtur Romanam edidit F. Blass, Teubner, 1896. J. Viteau states Blass's theory, but can not fully accept it. 9) Grammatik des neutestamentischen Griechisch, von F. Blass, Goettingen, 1896. J. Viteau, highly praising this work, points out a few minor faults. 10) Joannis Laurentii Lydi Liber de ostentis et Calendaria Graeca omnia iterum edidit Curtius Wachsmuth, Leipzig, 1897. Noticed by Albert Martin, who pronounces it one of the best works of the Teubner collection. The revision is based upon several new MSS which not only furnish new readings but also fill lacunae. 11) Joannis Philoponi de opificio mundi Libri VII. Recensuit Gualterus Reichardt, Leipzig, 1898. Albert Martin gives an account of the works of J. Philoponus, and describes the present work with favorable comment, but regrets that the author did not himself examine the one MS in Vienna and has consequently given an entirely inadequate account of it. 12) Constantino Aurelj, Studio etimologico della parola "Italia" e degli altri nomi dati alla penisola, Roma, —. Of this work L. D. says: "La péninsule fut appelée *Vitul*, d'où, plus tard *Italia*, entre les années 1322 et 1320 av. J.-C. Ce n'est là qu'un spécimen des résultats, extrêmement précis, comme on voit, des recherches étymologiques de M. Aurelj. La connaissance, qui lui est particulière, de l'idiome 'tyrréhno-pélasge' lui a permis de fournir un grand nombre d'autres explications de noms propres ou communs, non moins précises et non moins certaines que celle d'*Italia*."

13) *Études de philologie musicale. Fragments de l'Énéide en musique, d'après un manuscrit inédit. Fac-similés, etc.*, par Jules Combarieu, Paris, 1898. Louis Duvau notices this work rather unfavorably, and devotes some space to the discussion of the "neume liquescent," that is, the note given to an accessory vowel inserted in a group of consonants divided between two syllables, as when *urbe* becomes *ur^obe*. The subject belongs to the music of the Middle Ages, and not to classical philology. 14) Eduard Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, Leipzig, 1898. Briefly and rather favorably described by L. H. The work is devoted to the art of prose-writing, and treats of the rhythmical laws of prose. 15) Hermann Peter, *Die geschichtliche Litteratur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I und ihre Quellen*, Leipzig, 1897. Philippe Fabia, recognizing the great learning and ability of the author as well as the great value of this work, regrets that he can not bestow upon it the praise it has received in other reviews. Especially faulty is the title of the book, and even the preface does not prepare one entirely for the contents. 16) H. Vandaele, *Qua mente Phaeder fabellas scripserit*, Paris, 1897. Georges Romain analyzes this doctor-dissertation, and finds it in the main a good work. 17) *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum libri, herausgegeben und erklärt von F. Vollmer*, Leipzig, 1898. Georges Lafaye reviews this work at some length, criticizing many details, but still pronounces the edition the most complete and important that has appeared since that of Markland. 18) H. Lietzmann. *Catenen. Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte und handschriftliche Ueberlieferung. Mit einem Beitrag von H. Usener*. Freiburg i. B., 1897. Max Bonnet explains the nature of these *Catena*e, or collections of the commentaries of various fathers on any given book of the Bible, analogous to our *Notae Variorum* on the classical writers. He finds the work satisfactory in every respect. Usener demonstrates that a commentary on Job attributed to Origen was really written by Julian of Halicarnassus.

No. 4.

1. Pp. 329-32. Note on Soph. El. 86-91, by L. Parmentier. The traditional text is defended and *γῆς ἰσόμοιρ' ἀήρ* is interpreted as meaning (with a familiar scientific theory of the day) "air consisting partly (half) of earth." The whole phrase *φάος ἀγνόν και γῆς ἰσόμοιρ' ἀήρ* denotes the light of day, *φάος ἀγνόν* being one extreme and *γῆς ἰσόμοιρ' ἀήρ* the other, of what makes up the whole, somewhat after the analogy of *τὰς οὐσας και τὰς ἀπούσας ἐπιθας*. It is difficult to make the explanation clear in a few words.

2. Pp. 333-45. The reign and death of Poppaea, by Philippe Fabia. In this interesting historical essay, the view is defended at length that Nero killed Poppaea, but not deliberately. The

article treats of some events subsequent to her death, for the purpose of showing how greatly Nero mourned her loss, and how powerful an influence her charms exerted.

3. Pp. 346-50. Max Niedermann defends the statement of Pseudoplutarch that Andocides was of the race of Κήρυκες.

4. Pp. 351-3. Georges Romain reads *quanto* for *aliquanto* in Plaut. Aul. 539, and expresses the opinion that there is a lacuna before this verse. The reasons he assigns seem strong.

5. Pp. 354-63. Epigraphic notes, by B. Haussoullier. This article is divided into three parts. I. Three metrical (elegiac) inscriptions now in Constantinople are published and discussed. They contain nothing of great importance. II. An inscription of Delphi (published and discussed in the Bul. de Cor. Hel. XXI, Dec.) is further examined. It relates chiefly to architects employed on works in Epidaurus. III. An inscription of Thespieae (published in the same number of the B. de C. H.) is discussed, and by means of a comparison of it with CIGS. I 1733, light is thrown upon the manner of letting contracts. It is demonstrated that *προστάρης* is synonymous with *ἔγγυος*.

6. Pp. 364-6. Book Notices. 1) The *Medea* of Euripides, by E. S. Headlam, Cambridge, 1897. Noticed favorably by E. Chambry. 7) *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia, cum commentario critico* edidit C. M. Francken, Lugduni Batavorum. Louis Duvau, though finding several things capable of improvement, considers the book worthy of favorable reception.

The *Revue des Revues*, commenced in No. 2 and continued in No. 3, is completed in this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

BRIEF MENTION.

Professor BAUER, of Graz, has done good service by resuming his report of Greek historical literature, which he had brought down to 1888 in *Bursian's Jahresbericht* for 1889. The present volume is entitled *Die Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte, 1888-1898, verzeichnet und besprochen* (Munich, Beck), and gives a valuable survey of what has been done in Germany during the said decennium, accompanied in many instances with critical appreciations. To be sure, there is no scale. The length of the notice depends on the interest of the reviewer, and the summaries are now meagre, now so full that those who have not access to the works under review, or time for the study of them, will be thankful to Professor BAUER for his abstracts, as Professor BAUER himself has had occasion to be thankful to others for notices of works which he has not seen with his own eyes. His treatment of French and English books is, as might have been expected, not so satisfactory as his review of German contributions to Greek history. His review of Hauvette, for instance, has a spiteful tone, and it is astonishing that he should have despatched Macan's elaborate study of Herodotos's second triad as an inaccessible continuation of Sayce's libel on the great historian, miscalled an edition of the first three books. The English editors of Thukydides have fared little better, so that, after all, the book lacks that exhaustiveness which is the German's peculiar boast. There is an introduction of eighteen pages, followed by the inscriptions, papyri, topographical and numismatic memoirs. Thereupon we pass in review treatises on the historians of the Greeks and discussions of the sources of Greek history, general works on the history of the East and of Greece, and special works on the various periods—the time before the Persian wars, the age of the Persian wars, the period from the end of the Persian wars to the end of the Peloponnesian war, from the end of the Peloponnesian war to Alexander the Great, the age of Alexander, the successors of Alexander, and the Aetolian and Achaean leagues. The closing chapter deals with chronology. The index gives simply a list of authors, though it promises more. To review the reviews and criticize the criticism of so crowded a book as Professor BAUER'S is will hardly be expected of *Brief Mention*, but it may be permissible to call attention to his preliminary discussion of the relation of the natural to the historico-philological sciences. History and philology, it is commonly contended and commonly conceded, lack the exactness of the peculiar methods of natural science. They give, for instance, no scope for experiment, the

great instrument and the great verifier of research. This is Wachsmuth's point of view, and those who have had occasion to plead for the educational value of philological studies are not dissatisfied with it. Life is not an exact science, and the problems of conduct—which constitutes life—are not physical, much less mathematical, problems. But BAUER maintains that in regard to the certainty and uncertainty of the results, in regard to the inexhaustibility and absolute trustworthiness of the material, there is no such thoroughgoing difference between the two domains of knowledge. Nay, he maintains that the impression of the greater exactness of physical methods, of the greater certainty of the results and the deeper insight into the concatenation of the phenomena is due to the erroneous conception of scientific operations that belong to different stages of investigation. The imposing word 'law' is used in the physical world of mere hypotheses, of mere convenient groupings of analogous phenomena. True, the number of observations in the domain of natural science is much larger and there is a much larger sum of results to be gained by means of pure induction. But error is not excluded from the one field any more than from the other. A mistake in reading a microscopic preparation is parallel with a mistake in reading a palimpsest. The difference is simply in the material. That material is far richer in the domain of physical science; but there are no unbroken series in physical science any more than in history and philology, and as to the ascertainment of the facts, repeated study of the material gives the historian, the philologist something of the same advantage that the man of physical science finds in experiment. Neither physicist nor historian can rest satisfied with mere inductions, and both domains are open to the invasions of subjectivity. Law is for both often nothing more than a figure. Chemical affinity and attraction of gravitation explain nothing. Heredity, adaptation and differentiation, the wave-theory of light and electricity are mere hypotheses, and the survival of the fittest in the realm of nature has recently been offset by the scientific theory of the extirpation of the best in the realm of political life. The main difference between the two groups lies, according to Professor BAUER, not in the greater exactness of the methods and the results on the one side, and in the greater subjectivity on the other, but in the immediateness with which the physicist can observe and in the advantage he possesses of repeating observation by experiment. But the advantage is not so great as it seems. The investigator of nature is in danger of confounding genus, species and variety quite as much as is his historical brother. The inexplicable plants itself on the track of the one as it plants itself on the track of the other. The individual asserts itself in both domains, but the student of nature is interested in the individual as a type; the student of history values the individual as an individual, or, as BAUER is careful to add, ought to do so. But

the fact is that the ancient historians were as careful of the type as Nature herself, and their typical use of historical characters presents many problems to the modern investigator. However, we must leave Professor BAUER to fight the battles of philologist and historian and to minimize the advantage of the methods of physical research. At the same time it is interesting to note that Brunetière advocates the application of the evolutionary method so long dominant in the realm of Nature to the study of literature, and finds that the knowledge of the class is the only true way to the appreciation of the individual.

SCHNEIDEWIN'S Preface to his first edition of *Sophokles' Aias* and *Philoketes* bears date October, 1849. It is therefore nearly fifty years since the inauguration of the edition which still bears his name and the rare merit of which was widely recognized and at once. The gifted scholar, whom I was proud to call my master, did not live many years to enjoy his success, and the work was taken up by the eminent Grecian, AUGUST NAUCK. The SCHNEIDEWIN-NAUCK *Sophokles* has never lost ground. The *Oidipus Tyrannos* has had ten editions; the least popular of the seven plays, the *Trachiniai*, six. To this legacy EWALD BRUHN has succeeded, and the first half-century of the edition has been emphasized by an outrider, called by the new editor an appendix, which deals with the Syntax and Style of Sophokles (Berlin, Weidmann). It is not an elaborate disquisition. It is nothing but numbered headings and examples. The headings serve to show the editor's conception of the phenomena; the examples are reinforced by additional illustrations, especially from the drama. There is no sorting of the material under the rubrics of dialogue and chorus. It is, as Professor BRUHN says, hard to draw the line between syntax and style, and I should be the last one to dispute his contention, inasmuch as syntax is style to a much greater extent than many people suppose. At the same time, it seems to me that BRUHN'S treatment of the stylistic side, as he conceives it, is more illuminating than his treatment of the syntactical side, and gives a clearer insight into the sources of the peculiar bitter tang that pervades the Sophoklean honey. But Sophoklean syntax can not be despatched in this text-book fashion, this catechetic fashion. It must be judged first by dramatic syntax. A few specimens, occasional parallels will not suffice. We must know more. An American scholar has given us an exhaustive treatise on the genitive in Sophokles, as a German scholar had previously given us an exhaustive study of the Sophoklean accusative; but unless we know as exhaustively how Aischylos, how Euripides handles these cases, we can not make the desired differentiation, such as we are at least able to divine when we read the treatise of Weber on the final sentence.

Sophokles is bold in his use of the genitive as a whence-case. Every one remembers his O. T. 142: *βάθρων ἴστασθε*. How does Euripides compare in this regard? Euripides is bold in his handling of the whither-accusative. How does Sophokles compare? How do the different dramatists stand in respect of hyperepic usage? What does our touchstone, Aristophanes, report? The omission of *ἄν* with subj. is not one problem, but several; and it might be maintained with some show of reason that we have in one passage purposeful retention of an epic construction, in another survival, in a third considerations of euphony. Adherescence is not the sole, perhaps not the chief, explanation of *οὐ* for *μή* with the indicative. Then the investigator must beware of exaggerating, beware of minimizing phenomena. In one section (§135) BRUHN says that *ὡς* is added to the predicative participle without any special significance, or, if any, with the faintest. Yet the construction serves to blunt the sharp edge of knowledge, and with some of the verbs the construction is impossible without *ὡς*. It is fashionable to say that the historical present is achronic, that it is timeless, that it belongs to an early stratum of language. But knowing, as we do, that it is absent from the epic; that it has little, if any, standing-ground in higher lyric; that it comes into literature through the drama, one might hesitate before saying with BRUHN that the historical present is used without any especial vividness. True, as Lane has pointed out, there is what he calls an Annalistic Present "used in brief historical or personal memoranda to note incidents day by day or year by year as they occur" (L. Grammar, §1591), and there is no vividness in the Annalistic Present. Annals are not history. But the vividness of the Historical Present proper is due precisely to the fact of this forced contemporaneousness, so to speak. We may modify, we can not do away with the dictum of antique aesthetics, and the author of the *περὶ ὕψους* says distinctly (c. XXV): *ὅταν γε μὴν τὰ παρεληλυθότα τοῖς χρόνοις εἰσάγῃς ὡς γινόμενα καὶ παρόντα οὐ διήγησιν ἔτι τὸν λόγον ἀλλ' ἐναγώνιον πρᾶγμα ποιήσεις*. And after citing a familiar passage from Xenophon (Cyr. VII 1, 37), he adds: *τοιούτος ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ὁ Θουκυδίδης*. But all this amounts to saying that absolute agreement on the significance of syntactical phenomena does not exist, and I do not mean to detract from the value of BRUHN's work, which is undeniably useful to the student of syntax as well as to the student of Sophokles, and there are doubtless many who will prefer sober statement to supersubtle interpretation.

The quotation just made from the author of the *περὶ ὕψους* naturally suggests a brief mention of the new edition by Professor ROBERTS (Cambridge, The University Press), the same scholar to whom we are indebted for an interesting and instructive book on the Boeotians (A. J. P. XVI 373-5) and for an essay on

Caecilius of Calacte (A. J. P. XVIII 302-12). The edition, the first English edition for sixty years, has long been in preparation, as we learn from the preface, in connection with a larger undertaking, 'A History of Greek Literary Criticism.' Some such larger study is necessary for the appreciation of the so-called Longinus, and the editor's way of handling literary topics gives just ground for pleasant anticipations. In the Introduction Professor ROBERTS takes up the question of the authorship and discusses the contents and character of the work. The author is an unknown writer and the time the first century. What he says of the contents and character, how he has managed the translation, how the textual, linguistic, literary and bibliographical appendices can not be indicated here without anticipating a review by another hand, which has been promised for a later number of the Journal. When that time comes, I may return to the subject.

The vitality of the HAUPT and SAUPPE *Collection* (Weidmann) is not confined to one or two members of the series, such as the Schneidewin-Nauck Sophokles mentioned above. The fifth volume of HALM's ed. of *Ciceros Ausgewählte Reden* appears in a tenth improved issue under the management of G. LAUBMANN. The first edition appeared in 1850, the first year of my student life in Germany, and the comparison of the two editions has a certain personal interest to me which I could not hope to impart to the average reader of the Journal. And yet it might be safe to say that not necessarily the worst plan of studying the recent history of classical philology and the drift of pedagogical courses would be a comparison of the different editions of such text-books as have been adapted to the use of schools from time to time. The volume before us contains the *Pro Milone*, the *pro Q. Ligario*, and the *pro Rege Deiotaro*. The bulk is very nearly the same as that of the first edition, whereas almost all new editions are blown up with a quill: and the abridgments as well as the additions are noteworthy. Things that interested deeply the original editor fifty years ago are not now allowed to expand so freely, and the short method of interpretation by means of a German rendering is freely resorted to in the later issues of this standard Cicero.

Dr. KENYON, the accomplished palaeographer, to whom the philological world owes so much for his decipherment of recently recovered Greek authors, has brought out a treatise on *The Palaeography of Greek Papyri* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press), a beautiful volume, with twenty facsimiles and a table of alphabets.

In the first chapter he treats of the range of the subject, which is a development of quite recent years. In the following chapters he discusses papyrus as writing-material, distinguishes between non-literary and literary papyri, and, in accordance with his previous studies, marks off three periods—the Ptolemaic, represented by the Petrie papyri, the Roman period, and the Byzantine—and gives the characteristics of each. "Non-literary papyri," he says, "are plentiful and fairly well supplied with precise dates; literary papyri are comparatively rare and can seldom be dated, even approximately, on other than purely palaeographical evidence." Hence the importance, palaeographically, of the chapters on the literary papyri of the Ptolemaic and of the Roman period. In the Byzantine period there are no literary papyri. The Arab conquest of Egypt gave the papyrus its death-blow. Papyrus gives way to vellum; the roll to the codex. The minuscule hand, which for fifteen hundred years had been confined to non-literary documents, enters the line of literary tradition. It is as old, we are assured, as the set uncial, but its function was less dignified, and its emergence reminds one of those linguistic phenomena that suddenly force their way into good society. The uncial hand became exhausted, like the old nobility, and the vulgar minuscule passed on the torch of learning and passes it on still. Here as everywhere we have the triumph of the business world, the vulgar world, and palaeography becomes a branch of what we are forced to call sociology. The readers of the Journal may be interested to know that the Ayer papyrus published with facsimile in the last volume is assigned by Dr. Kenyon to a date not later than the first century after Christ.

Men of English stock have seldom shown much sympathy with Drumann in his systematic blackening of Cicero. Life and character are not all of one color any more than the black spirits and white, red spirits and grey of the weird sisters. His political course does not commend itself to those whose motto is 'Thorough.' His eloquence is puffy to us, as it was to some of his own people; but to call his writings a Sahara, as Mommsen does, is eminently unfair, as it is decidedly inconsistent; and as one grows old one becomes more indulgent and less disposed to withhold from Cicero the terse praise of Augustus: *λόγιος ἀνὴρ καὶ φιλόπατρις*. In a study of rare brilliancy Zieliński has shown the immense influence that Cicero has exerted on the world of the last two thousand years, an influence no second-rate soul could have wielded; and Max Schneidewin has paid to Cicero's *humanitas* a tribute which would have been more effective if it had been less bulky, yet one which no student of ethics can afford to neglect (A. J. P. XVIII 247). But these are both advocates and have to be studied as such. In a recent number of the *Deutsche*

Rundschau (April, 1899), Professor HÜBNER takes the attitude of a judge, and few articles intended for the wider public deserve to be pondered so carefully by the classical scholar. He does not undertake to give a final answer to the complicated problem, but he does make the undoubted paling of Cicero's star more comprehensive. An age of radicalism and Caesarism can not be just to a *novus homo* who tried to be a conservative, and the business speakers of our time can not have much sympathy with the copiousness of the too fluent orator. Even in America delight in oratory is rapidly becoming a mere tradition. Eloquence is relegated to the less 'progressive' communities. It is Southern here as it is Southern in Europe, and Professor HÜBNER, familiar with Italy and Spain, tells us that one must have heard Pio Nono and Ruggiero Bonghi and Gonzalez Bravo in order to form an idea of the effect of Ciceronian oratory.

In the *Nation* of May 18, 1899, I have already said what seemed to me most important to be said about RIEMANN and GOELZER'S *Syntaxe comparée du grec et du latin*, both by way of general characteristic and of detailed criticism. RIEMANN, who came to an untimely end some eight years ago, was predominantly a Latinist, and so is GOELZER, in spite of the *Cours grec Riemann et Goelzer*, and the book is stronger on the Latin than on the Greek side. Perhaps Latinists may think differently. The title is a misnomer, as Bréal, a friendly sponsor of the book, has pointed out. It is a parallel syntax, not a comparative syntax. The lines are drawn more closely now than they were some years ago. Egger's *Grammaire comparée*, a useful and suggestive little book in its day, is not what would now be called a comparative grammar, and the subtitle of Nägelsbach's *Lateinische Stilistik*, which runs *Ein sprachvergleichender Versuch*, has an odd sound in our ears. And so, despite the use that RIEMANN and GOELZER have made of recent literature, there is a lack of what may be called genetic treatment. The authors complain of the lack of material on the Greek side. It is a just complaint, but a little more vigilance would have revealed a number of things that have been published since 1883, the date of Hübner's indispensable *Grundriss*. Even the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, which they have cited from time to time—at second hand, it is to be feared—might have saved them from some mistakes. In view of the fact that Professor Hale's elaborate assault on the traditional doctrine of the sequence of tenses and moods in Latin (A. J. P. VIII 46 foll. and 228 foll.) has been disregarded, I may take comfort to myself that my study of the Greek participle (A. J. P. IX 137 foll.), which is a manner of contribution to comparative syntax and which has been summarized in a recent number of the Belgian *Revue des Huma-*

nités, has found no consideration. But in discussing the σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν, RIEMANN and GOELZER have nothing more recent to cite than a dissertation by Wilpert of 1878, and find themselves forced to record in the corrections that in 1897 Wilpert had recanted some of his statements. Would it not have been easy to consult Haydon's paper in A. J. P. XI 182 foll.? Dyroff, *Die Geschichte des Pronomen reflexivum*, which is cited in the introduction, does not seem to have been used in the body of the work, any more than Professor MILLER's compendium of Dyroff (A. J. P. XVIII 214 foll.). But the criticism of details would carry me beyond the limits of *Brief Mention*, and one grows weary of insisting on points that have been already made and made in vain. The book is one of substantial value. The advanced student must have it at hand, build on it here and reject it there. It is a provisional work. What is not provisional?

C. E. M.: Mr. FAIRBANKS' book, *The First Philosophers of Greece* (Charles Scribner's Sons), has proved somewhat disappointing to those who hoped to find it a trustworthy guide for readers unacquainted with Greek who wish to gain access to the sources of our knowledge of Greek philosophy. The plan and arrangement of the book are excellent, but these merits are more than counterbalanced by the frequent and palpable inaccuracy of its translations. A few salient examples must suffice. Fairbanks, p. 6, Dox. 315 we find ἀπέγνωσαν translated 'recognize' instead of 'reject' in the statement "The physicists, followers of Thales all recognize that the void is really a void," completely reversing the meaning of the passage. F., p. 18, Simplicius Phys. 32 r. 149, 32 ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦτου μόνου Θεόφραστος ἐν τῇ Ἱστορίᾳ τὴν μάνωσιν εἶρηκε καὶ πύκνωσιν δῆλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι τῇ μανότητι καὶ πυκνότητι ἐχρῶντο is translated as follows: 'Of this one writer alone, Theophrastus, in his account of the Physicists, uses the words μάνωσις and πύκνωσις of texture. The rest, of course, spoke of μανότης and πυκνότης.' This certainly gives no suggestion of the true meaning, namely: 'In reference to him alone, Theophrastus, in his account, has spoken of rarification and condensation. But it is obvious that the others also *made use* of rareness and denseness' (i. e. made use of them in their philosophy, though they did not employ these words).—F., p. 85, Dox. 362, παρέλκειν is translated 'drags the moon after it,' instead of 'is superfluous.' The moon is here distinguished from the sun, which serves a purpose in the generation of the world.—F., p. 129. The overlooking of καὶ, Simpl. De Caelo 137 r., results in the perverted translation of φημένους γὰρ εἶναι πολλὰ καὶ αἰδία 'though we said that many things are eternal,' instead of 'though we said that things are many and eternal.'—F., p. 218, λόγος τῆς μίξεως, Arist. De An. I, 4. 408-14, is

translated 'the cause of the mixture,' instead of 'the ratio in the mixture.'—F., p. 219, De Sens. 441-4, ἀναίσθητα, referring to taste, is translated 'invisible,' instead of 'imperceptible,' and the passage is reduced to nonsense.

M. W.: In editing the *Monumentum Ancyranum* with brief notes, and furnishing an English translation, Dr. WILLIAM FAIRLEY, of the University of Pennsylvania, has done a welcome service, inasmuch as he has summed up and made available the results of the discussion which have appeared since the date of Mommsen's important edition in 1883. This American edition is much more valuable than the French one of C. Peltier (1886), which was simply an abridgment of Mommsen with many errors. The introduction would have been more interesting if Dr. FAIRLEY had given a somewhat fuller account of the controversy which has been waged, especially among German scholars, as to the character and purpose of the inscription. He himself sides with Bormann in regarding it as an epitaph, but a more detailed statement of the arguments urged against this view might well have been given. The commentary given at the foot of the page is brief and is more concerned with the verification of facts than with the language of the inscription, but one can hardly quarrel with this in a volume appearing under the auspices of the Department of History. Inasmuch, however, as some knowledge of Latin may fairly be assumed of those who use the book, we should prefer in a note like that on c. 3, "Mommsen is almost alone in holding to 'surviving,'" to use *superstitibus* rather than the English word. On c. 23 one might expect to find a reference to the inscription on the secular games published in the eighth volume of the *Ephemeris*. An English edition of this inscription with notes available for college use would be very welcome.

W. K. C.: The appearance of a new edition, after an interval of eight years, of KIESSLING'S *Odes of Horace* (Weidmann) awakened pleasant expectations in all familiar with that serviceable and suggestive edition. We are rudely awakened when we learn from the prefatory note of HEINZE, the reviser, already favorably known for his work on Lucretius, that lack of time had prevented the revision of any part save the commentary on the *Carmen Seculare*, and the introduction to what has been rewritten in the light of the official inscription discovered in 1890. The notes have undergone less change, though numerous additions have been made and the phraseology altered in a number of cases. Disappointing as the book is, through the lack of a

complete revision, it is in a way gratifying as an indication of the thorough and scholarly work to be expected from HEINZE hereafter. Not a change has been made that does not commend itself as a decided improvement.

C. A.: It was in the pages of this Journal that Mr. WIENER first made known to English scholars the linguistic peculiarities of the so-called Yiddish dialect (A. J. P. XIV 41-67, 456-82). He has now laid all students under a new obligation by his *History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century* (Charles Scribner's Sons). This literature has presented a most remarkable evidence of vitality since 1881, when the Russianizing of the Jews in the Czar's dominions was suddenly arrested by reactionary edicts and the ablest of Russian Jewish writers felt it a duty to employ the homely tongue of the great mass of their co-religionists. The bibliography bears witness to their activity and the chrestomathy gives specimens from which it will not be invidious to single out the story of Bontsie Silent, by Perez, a gem which would do credit to any literature. It is given to few writers to have the opportunity of presenting so novel a subject to the reading world.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Epictetus. *The Moral Discourses*; tr. by Eliz. Carter; ed. by W. H. D. Rouse. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 2 v. (Temple Classics.) 16mo, cl., @ 50 cts.

Euripides. *The Tragedies of Euripides in English Verse*, by Arthur S. Way. In 3 v. V. 3. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 24 + 494 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$2.

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives*; Englished by Sir T. North; ed. by W. H. D. Rouse. In 10 v. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. (Temple Classics.) 16mo, cl., @ 50 cts.

Sophocles. *The Antigone of Sophocles*; tr., with introd. and notes, by G. Herbert Palmer. Boston, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1899. c. 4 + 100 pp. 12mo, cl., 75 cts.

Suetonius Tranquillus (Caius). *History of the Twelve Caesars*; tr. into English by Philemon Holland, 1606; with an introd. by C. Whibley. New York, *C. Scribner Sons*, 1899. 2 v., 283; 311 pp. (Tudor Translations.) Sq. 8vo, cl., net \$10.

ENGLISH.

Cambridge Compositions, Greek and Latin. Edited by R. D. Archer Hind and R. D. Hicks. London, 1899. 8vo, 508 pp. 10s.

Gent (B. E.) *New Dictionary of the Terms of the Canting Crew*. London, 1899. 8vo. 21s.

Maha-Bharata. *Epic of Ancient India condensed into English Verse* by Romesh Dutt. London, 1899. 8vo. With 12 photograv. 12s. 6d.

Murray (J. A. H.) *A New English Dictionary, on Historical Principles. Series II, Part 4. Frank-law-Glass-cloth*. London, 1899. 4to. 12s. 6d.

— Vol. IV. *Germano-Glass-cloth*. Vol. V. *Hod-Horizontal*. à 2s. 6d.

Psellus, *The History of*. Edited by O. Sathas. London, 1899. 8vo. 15s.

Rivington (L.) *The Roman Primary A. D. 430-451*. London, 1899. 8vo, 428 pp. 7s. 6d.

Thomas (C.) *Introduction to the Study of North American Archaeology*. London, 1899. 8vo, 406 pp. 8s.

FRENCH.

Audouin (E.) *De la déclinaison dans les langues indo-européennes*. Gr. in-8. *C. Klincksieck*. 8 fr.

— *De Plauti anapaestis*. In-8. *C. Klincksieck*. 4 fr.

- Ballin (L.) *Le Mahâbhârata*. In-8, 450 p. *Leroux*. 10 fr.
 Bayard (Abbé L.) *Notes de grammaire latine*. In-12. *C. Klincksieck*.
 I fr. 50.
 Debove (G. M.) et Achard (Ch.) *Manuel de diagnostic médical*. In-8,
 ii + 652 p. *J. Rueff*. 18 fr.
 Hagemans (G.) *Lexique français-hiéroglyphique*. Gr. in-8 à 2 col., xiii +
 928 p. *Leroux*. 35 fr.
 Maspéro (G.) *Bibliothèque égyptologique, t. IX. Œuvres diverses de F.*
Chabas, t. I. In-8, 320 p. *Leroux*. 15 fr.
 Masqueray (P.) *Traité de métrique grecque*. In-12. *C. Klincksieck*.
 3 fr. 50.
 Nyrop. *Grammaire historique de la langue française, tome Ier*. In-8, xvi
 + 488 p. *Picard et fils*. 10 fr.

GERMAN.

- Aeschyli Choephoroi. Cum annotatione critica et commentario ed. Fred.
 H. M. Blaydes. gr. 8. vi, 196 S. Halle, *Buchh. des Waisenhauses*. m. 4.
 Andresen (Georgius). In Taciti historias studia critica et palaeographica.
 Progr. 4. 23 S. m. I Taf. Berlin, *R. Gaertner*. m. 1.
 Brockelmann (Carl). *Syrische Grammatik m. Litteratur, Chrestomathie u.*
Glossar. 8. xiii, 110 u. 190 S. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 7.
Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum. gr. 8. vii, 182 S. m. I Taf.
 Brussels, *H. Lamertin*. m. 6.40.
 Ciceronis (M. Tullii) orationes selectae XVIII. Ex recognitione Caroli
 Halmii. Ed. alteram curavit G. Laubmann. Pars II. 8. 206 S. Berlin,
Weidmann. m. 1.80.
Commentationes philologiae Ienenses, ediderunt seminarii philologorum
Ienensis professores. Vol. VI, pars II. gr. 8. iii, 229 S. Leipzig, *B. G.*
Teubner. m. 6.
 Dahlmann (Jos.) *Mahâbhârata-Studien*. I. Genesis des Mahâbhârata.
 gr. 8. xxxiv, 290 S. Berlin, *F. L. Dames*. m. 15.
 Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant. Vol. V. *Opusculorum vol. I*. Edd.
 Herm. Usener et Ludov. Radermacher. 8. xlv, 438 S. Leipzig, *B. G.*
Teubner. m. 6.
 Euripidis fabulae, edd. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. II, pars VI. gr. 8.
 Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.—II 6. *Iphigenia Aulidensis*. Ed. N. Wecklein.
 91 S. m. 2.80.
 Frankenberg (Johs.) *Studiorum Aristoteleorum specimen*. Progr. 4.
 21 S. Berlin, *R. Gaertner*. m. 1.
 Germanici Caesaris Aratea. Iterum ed. Alfr. Breysig. *Accedunt epigram-*
mata. 8. xxxiv, 92 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.
 Heraeus (Wilh.) *Die Sprache des Petronius u. die Glossen*. Progr. 4.
 50 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.
 Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. I. *Heronis v. Alex-*
andria Druckwerke u. Automatentheater. Griechisch u. deutsch hrsg. v.
 Wilh. Schmidt. Mit 124 Fig. 8. lxxii, 514 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.
 m. 9.
 — dasselbe. *Suppl. Die Geschichte der Textüberlieferung*. Griechisches
 Wortregister. Mit 6 Fig. 8. 181 S. Ebd. m. 3.

- Ibn Sa'id. Kitâb al-muğrib fi hulâ al-mağrib. Buch IV. Textausg. nach der originalen Handschrift u. deutsche Bearbeitg. Von Knut L. Tallqvist. gr. 4. 132, 8 u. 182 S. Leiden, *Buchh. u. Buchdr. vorm. E. J. Brill.* m. 17.
- Jahn (Paul). Die Art der Abhängigkeit Vergils v. Theokrit. 2. Fortsetz. Progr. 4. 36 S. Berlin, *R. Gaertner.* m. 1.
- Jahrbücher f. classische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alfr. Fleckeisen. 25. Suppl.-Bd. 1. Hft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.*—1. Diehl (Ernest). *De m finali epigraphica.* 326 S. m. 12.
- Jahresbericht, kritischer, üb. die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. Karl Vollmöller. IV. Bd. 1895, 1896. 1. u. 2. Hft. gr. 8. 1. Tl., S. 1-396, u. 4. Tl., S. 1-72. Erlangen, *F. Junge.* m. 17.55.
- Krause (Arn.) Zum Barlaam u. Josaphat des Gui v. Cambrai. 1. Tl.: Zum Text der Dichtg. Progr. 4. 30 S. Berlin, *R. Gaertner.* m. 1.
- Lage (Bertha v. der). Studien zur Genesislegende. 2. Tl. Progr. 4. 23 S. Berlin, *R. Gaertner.* m. 1.
- Litteraturdenkmäler, lateinische, des XV. u. XVI. Jahrh. Hrsg. v. Max Herrmann. 14. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann.*—14. Secundus (Ioannes Nicolai). Basia. Von Geo. Ellinger. lli, 38 S. m. 2.
- Lucreti Cari (T.) de rerum natura libri VI. Ed. Adph. Brieger. Ed. ster. (emendator). 8. lxxxiv, 230 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.10.
- Lycurgi oratio in Leocratem. Post Carol. Scheibe ed. Frider. Blass. Ed. maior. 8. xliv, 86 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. —90.
- Maurenbrecher (Bertold). Forschungen zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte u. Metrik. 1. Hft. Hiatus u. Verschleifg. im alten Lateinischen. gr. 8. viii, 269 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 7.
- Müller (W. Max). Die Liebespoesie der alten Aegypter. Mit 18 Taf. in Autogr. u. 3 Taf. in Lichtdr. gr. 4. v, 46 S. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 22.
- Musici scriptores graeci. Recognovit, prooemiis et indice instruxit Carol. Janus. Supplementum, melodiarum reliquiae. 8. 61 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.20.
- Otto (Gualt.) Nomina propria latina oriunda a participiis perfecti. [Aus 'Jahrb. f. class. Philol.'] gr. 8. S. 743-932. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 5.60.
- Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt. Recognoverunt Leop. Cohn et Paul. Wendland. Ed. minor. Vol. III. Recognovit W. 8. x, 290 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* m. 2.
- Plato's Vertheidigungsrede des Sokrates. Eingeleitet, übers. u. erläutert v. Heinr. Steph. Sedlmayer. gr. 8. iv, 76 S. Wien, *C. Konegen.* m. 1.50.
- Procli Diadochi in Platonis rem publicam commentarii. Ed. Guil. Kroll. Vol. I. 8. vii, 296 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 5.
- Püschel (Herm.) Der syntaktische Gebrauch der Conjunctionen in den Adverbialsätzen bei Hans Sachs. Diss. gr. 8. 120 S. Leipzig, *E. Gräfe.* m. 2.
- Schultze (Mart.) Grammatik der aramäischen Muttersprache Jesu. 8. iv, 87 S. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.* m. 2.40.
- Schwab (Joa.) Nomina propria latina oriunda a participiis praesentis activi, futuri passivi, futuri activi quae quando quomodo ficta sint. [Aus 'Jahrb. f. class. Philol.'] gr. 8. S. 637-742. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.20.

Skizzen lebender Sprachen. Hrsg. v. Wilh. Vietor. 1. Nordenglisch. 12. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.—1. Lloyd (Rich. J.) Northern English. Phonetics. Grammar. Texts. vi, 127 S. m. 3.

Stengel (E.) Die altprovenzalische Liedersammlung c der Laurenziana in Florenz. gr. 8. iv, 76 S. Leipzig, *Dieterich*. m. 3.

Stolz (Frdr.) Ueber die Entwicklung der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft. Vortrag. gr. 8. 24 S. Innsbruck, *Wagner*. m. —80.

Stucken (Ed.) Astralmythen der Hebräer, Babylonier u. Aegypter. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchgn. 3. Tl. Jakob. gr. 8. S. 127-187. Leipzig, *E. Pfeiffer*. m. 6.40.

Theodori Pediasimi eiusque amicorum quae exstant ed. Max. Treu. Progr. gr. 8. 62 S. Potsdam, *M. Jaekel*. m. 2.

ITALIAN.

Mares. Maris, Amri et Silbae de patriarchis Nestorianorum commentaria. Ed. ac Latine reddidit Henr. Gismondi, S. J. Pars I. Maris textus arabicus et versio latina. 2 voll. gr. 8. vii, ii, 179 u. iv, 135 S. Roma. m. 20.

Pullé. Studi italiani di filologia Indo-Iranica. Anno II. Vol. II. Pisa. 8vo, p. 112. L. 15.

Studi glottologici italiani diretti da Giacomo De Gregorio. Vol. I. Torino. 8vo, p. 245. L. 10.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Arvanitopullo (A. S.) *Questioni di diritto attico. I. Dei debitori verso lo stato ateniese.* Roma, *Casa editrice italiana.* L. 1.50.
- Boll (Franz). *Beiträge zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen Astrologie u. Astronomie.* (K. bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., 1893, Heft 1.) München, 1899.
- Catalogue of Authors whose Works are published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Boston, *H., M. & Co.*, 1899.
- Chadwick (H. M.) *Studies in Old English.* (Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society, vol. IV, part II.) London, *C. J. Clay & Sons*, 1899. 6s.
- Ciceronis (M. T.) *Orationes selectae XVIII ex recogn. C. Halmii.* Ed. alt. curavit G. Laubmann. Pars Posterior. Berolini, *apud Weidmannos*, MDCCC-LXXXIX. 1 m. 80 pf.
- Ciceros Ausgewählte Reden. Erkl. v. Karl Halm. Fünfter Band. 1ote verb. Auflage, besorgt v. G. Laubmann. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1899. 1 m. 35 pf.
- Corsen (Peter). *Zwei neue Fragmente der Weingartner Prophetenhandschrift.* Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1899. 3 m.
- Educational Review. Ed. by N. M. Butler. June, 1899. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.* \$3 per annum.
- Ferguson (William Scott). *The Athenian Archons of the Third and Second Centuries B. C.* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. X.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 75 cts.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. IX. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1898. \$1.50.
- Hempl (George). *Language-Rivalry and Speech-Differentiation in the Case of Race-Mixture.* (Reprinted from 'Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.')
- Boston, *Ginn & Co.*
- *Origin of the Runes.* (Reprinted from 'Jour. of Germanic Philology,' II 3.) Bloomington, Ind., 1899.
- Horton-Smith (L.) *Galileo. Versi Latini presentati alla R. Accademia in Padova.* *Atti e Memorie*, vol. XV.
- *Note on Rigveda i. 48. 15.* (Reprinted from 'Journal of Philology,' XXV.)
- 49 Sanskrit, Greek and Latin Derivatives from I.G. 4EU-. (Bezenbergers Beiträge, XXII 314.)
- Iustiniani Institutiones. Recensuit P. Krüger. Ed. altera. Berolini, *apud Weidmannos*, MDCCCLXXXIX. 1 m. 60 pf.
- Masqueray (P.) *Traité de métrique grecque.* Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1899.
- Mather (M. W.) and Wheeler (A. L.) *Latin Prose Writing.* With full introductory notes on idiom. New York and London, *Harper & Bros.*, 1899.

Modern Language Association of America, Publications of the. Ed. by James W. Bright. Vol. XIV, No. 3 (N. S., vol. VII, No. 3).—IX. Garnett (J. M.) The Latin and the A.S. Juliana.—X. Wood (F. A.) The Semasiology of Words for 'Smell' and 'See.'—XI. Proper Names in O.E. Verse.—XII. Hart (J. M.) Nicholas Grimold's *Christus Redivivus*. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1899.

Mohl (F. George). Introduction à la chronologie du latin vulgaire. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études, fasc. 122.) Paris, *Émile Bouillon*, 1899.

— Le couple roman lui : lei. (Bohemian, with résumé in French.) Prague, 1899.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II (Deutsch-Englisch). In 24 Lfgn. @ 1 m. 50 pf. Lfg. 11: Gut-Herz. New York, *The International News Co.*

National Educational Association. Report on Normal Schools. College Entrance Requirements. Relations of Public Libraries to Public Schools. July, 1899. Chicago, Ill., *University of Chicago Press*.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας τοῦ ἔτους 1898. Ἀθήνησιν, 1899.

Revue des Humanités en Belgique trimestrielle. Avril 1899. *Hasselt*.

Richardson (L. J.) Carmina Anglica Latina, reddidit L. J. R. San Francisco, *Murdock*, 1899.

Sophokles. Erklärt v. F. W. Schneidewin u. A. Nauck. 8tes Bändchen. Anhang, zusammengest. v. Ewald Bruhn. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1899. 2 m. 25 pf.

Stratton (A. W.) History of Greek Noun-formations. I. Stems with -μ-. (Preprint from 'Studies in Classical Philology.') Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1899.

Usener (Hermann). Die Sintfluthsagen untersucht. Bonn, *Friedrich Cohen*, 1899.